This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

https://books.google.com

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

https://books.google.com

Rivera
GR1
F55
no.91
1930

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

UNIVERSITY OF CA RIVERSIDE, LIBRARY
3 1210 01788 5912

# FF COMMUNICATIONS

EDITED FOR THE FOLKLORE FELLOWS

BY

WALTER ANDERSON JOHANNES BOLTE

KAARLE KROHN KNUT LIESTØL

C. W. von SYDOW ARCHER TAYLOR

VOL. XXXII2

N:o 91

SUOMALAINEN TIEDEAKATEMIA, HELSINKI
ACADEMIA SCIENTIARUM FENNICA

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

FF COMMUNICATIONS N:o 91

# CHAUCER'S SHIPMAN'S TALE
# THE LOVER'S GIFT REGAINED

BY

JOHN WEBSTER SPARGO

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

*Il va de soi que notre relevé n'a pas la prétention d'être complet; quand il s'agit des migrations d'un conte, on ne l'est jamais.*

VICTOR CHAUVIN

HELSINKI, 1930
SUOMALAINEN TIEDEAKATEMIA
SOCIETAS SCIENTIARUM FENNICA

Digitized by Google

Haminassa 1930
Haminan Lehti Osakeyhtiön
Kirjapaino

Digitized by Google

TO
ARCHER TAYLOR

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

The initial efforts to study the background of some of Chaucer's stories were published more than forty years ago.[1] Since that time, each decade has seen more and more added to our knowledge of Chaucer's use of contemporary and antecedent sources, until to-day we know a not inconsiderable amount concerning his attitude toward the lore of past ages, although as yet no elaborate attempt has been made to generalize on that attitude.[2]

Among the most interesting of Chaucer's tales are those commonly called vulgar, the *fabliaux,* on which our "well of English undefiled" lavished some of his best literary efforts. For some of these *fabliaux*[3] we have studies of varying magnitude, and, indeed, for some the bibliography is quite extensive, but for the *Shipman's Tale* we have, so far as I know, no study of any kind. One scholar or another has speculated briefly; that is all.

---

[1] *Originals and Analogues of Some of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales,* edd. F. J. Furnivall, E. Brock, W. A. Clouston, London, 1872–87 (Chaucer Society, Second Series, nos. 7, 10, 15, 20, 22).

[2] Some indirect effort is made by E. F. Shannon, *Chaucer and the Roman Poets,* Cambridge, 1929 (*Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature,* VII).

[3] The tales of the Miller, the Reeve, the Pardoner, the Wife of Bath, the Summoner, the Merchant, and the Manciple may be included, under flexible definition, as *fabliaux.* Cf. J. Bédier, *Les fabliaux*[4], Paris, 1925, p. 30, and Sir Edmund Gosse's discussion in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica,* s. v. For studies of these tales, see J. E. Wells, *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English,* New Haven, 1916, pp. 877 ff., and the *Supplements.*

Digitized by Google

Miss Hammond reports: "Tyrwhitt said, Introd. Disc. xxxi, that 'this tale is generally supposed to be taken from the Decameron, Day 8, Novella 1, but I should rather believe that Chaucer was obliged to some old French Fableour, from whom Boccace had also borrowed the ground-work of his Novel.' Ten Brink, Hist. Eng. Lit. II: 172, Skeat III: 420, agree."[1] J. E. Wells adds: "The First Tale of the Tenth[2] Day of the *Decameron* is similar to the story told by the Shipman. But Skeat, Ten Brink, and others agree with Tyrwhitt's judgment that Chaucer got his matter from some French *fabliau,* greatly modifying his original." It is difficult to understand how a statement can be made to the effect that Chaucer greatly modified his original, when we have only the scantiest of ideas as to what that original was like!

Before proceeding to an examination of variants of the tale, it is desirable to summarize Chaucer's brilliantly-told version, which is to be found in lines 1191—1624 of Group B of the *Canterbury Tales.* Its length, 434 lines, is about average for a *fabliau.*[3]

> A rich merchant dwelling at Saint-Denis, who had a beautiful and pleasure-loving wife, was popular both for his generous hospitality and for his wife's winning ways. A certain young monk was one of his most frequent visitors. He and the merchant took such a fancy to one another that they became very intimate, and Dan John spent much time at the merchant's house.
>
> It happened that the merchant had to take a business trip, but before setting out he invited the monk to visit him. On the day of his departure, the merchant arose early and

[1] Chaucer, *A Bibliographical Manual,* New York, 1908, p. 284.

[2] A letter from Mr. Wells informs me that "Tenth" is a typographical error for "Eighth". See *A Manual,* etc., p. 704.

[3] I note only in passing F. Tupper's curious idea (*Publications of the Modern Language Association* XXIX (1914) 83 ff.) that this tale was intended by Chaucer as a sort of *exemplum* on the subject of Envy; cf. J. L. Lowes, *ibid.* XXX (1915) 237 ff.

Digitized by Google

betook himself to his counting-house. Dan John and the wife, also up early, met in the garden and fell to talk, discovering reciprocally tender feelings. The wife had to pay "an hundred frankes" for finery, and knew not where to get it, but suggested that if Dan John could help her to that sum she would do his will. The monk agreed, and, taking the merchant aside, requested the loan of a hundred francs in order to purchase some animals for his monastery. The merchant lent the money cheerfully, and set out for Bruges, while Dan John proceeded to his monastery in Paris.

The next Sunday the monk returned and fulfilled his agreement with the wife, turning over a hundred francs to her in return for her favors. When the merchant returned to Saint-Denis, business took him to Paris, where he met Dan John. In the course of their conversation the monk informed him casually that the borrowed hundred francs had been returned to the wife in his absence —

"she woot it wel, certeyn,
By certein tokenes that I can hir telle."

Upon his return home, the merchant scolded his wife for not having informed him of Dan John's repaying the money; she, vexed, cursed the monk and admitted receiving payment, but said that since she thought that it was a present in return for the hospitality which he had received, she had spent it for finery. The tale ends with a kindly admonition from the merchant that his wife be more careful in future about expenses.

What sort of plot have we in this tale? Is it a "transmissible" plot, one which is borrowed by one teller from another, or is it one which is likely to be found in any country and in any age, independently developed? Is it the sort of tale which is likely to become a wanderer, or is it of the autochthonous type? Bédier generalizes rather cleverly regarding what he calls the *nouvelle.* Such *fabliaux* or *nouvelles,* he says, are made up of two distinct factors: the observation of (1) universal feelings in (2) a very particular situation. The "universal feelings" are listed as the antagonism between the lover and the husband, the wife's trickery in deceiving the husband, jealousy among various

Digitized by Google

characters, and so on. The "particular situations" cited are the thousand and one complicated tricks by which a lover can gain his beloved, a wife can deceive her husband in order to further the escape of her lover, and so on.[1] The energy of diffusion and of duration of a given tale, he continues, consists on the one hand in the singularity of the situation, which makes the tale pleasing, tragic, easy of retention; on the other, in the universality of the feelings, which enables it to adapt itself to very diverse manners and customs.

Perhaps the main "universal situation" in the *Shipman's Tale* is that of the cuckolded husband. No more universal situation could be found for a medieval story, for there can be no doubt regarding the pleasure which our medieval ancestors took in hearing tales of horns sprouting from the heads of witless husbands. Moreover, the monk's presence as a factor of cuckoldom adds to the wide appeal of the universal situation. Here we have, then, an universal situation, which, according to Bédier, would tend to cause diffusion. That such tales actually do become diffused we all know from experience.

If we turn to the "singularity" of the *Shipman's Tale,* once again we find features which will justify us in inferring that we are dealing with a "transmissible" plot. There are no tragic elements in the situation, it is true, but there is a great plenty to make the story entertaining; and the plot is sufficiently simple and arresting to make it easy of retention. It is a merry tale, with an atmosphere of lightness and spring sunshine that Chaucer alone could give.

I am using Bédier's criteria for a "transmissible" plot here, not necessarily because I agree with those criteria, but because it is interesting to observe that according to the principles of even this arch-enemy of the theory of the

[1] *Les fabliaux*[4], p. 258.

Digitized by Google

transmission of popular tales, the Shipman's Tale may be a *Wandererzählung.*[1]

One of the difficulties underlying Bédier's refusal to admit the reality of tale-transmission is his unwillingness to recognize the validity of a certain convention which prevails among laborers in the vineyard of the popular tale. That convention either mystifies or makes skeptics of most investigators whose activities have been confined to research in literary fields. The student of literature is accustomed to dealing with formal documents, with attestable data, the physical representatives, so to speak, of actual facts; and therefore he who handles these documents feels that he is dealing with matters of fact, of sober, stationary, demonstrable, and immovable fact. Now the student of popular tales has no such secure rock upon which to build. His only documents are what written versions he can find; and these versions, when they are found, have to be treated, not as definite facts in the way that the student of literature would treat his documents, but simply as exponents of the living tale in its *chaîne traditionelle* through the ages. A written version of a tale is an accident. If a tale appealed particularly to a given hearer, it might chance to be written down — providing the hearer knew how to write. If not — and if so, too, as we shall see — the tale went on its way, to reappear a couple of centuries later and a continent

[1] Much of Bédier's *Les fabliaux* is devoted to brilliantly casuistical demolition of theories of tale-transmission which he vaguely attributes to other scholars, but which in general he himself has constructed *ad hoc*. See, *e. g.,* Cloetta, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* XLVIII (1894) 206—226; des Granges, *Romania* XXIV (1895) 135—42; Jacobs, *Folklore* VII (1896) 61—65; Euling, *Anzeiger für Deutsches Altertum* XXIII (1897) 265—270; von der Leyen, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* LX (1906) 292—300; and cf. *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde* XIX (1909) 213.

Digitized by Google

away, this time in a new environment, possibly now part of a romance, possibly reduced to an *exemplum* for religious edification, with a character or a situation more or less, with a changed background and an altered foreground.

These are the documents which the student of popular literature must handle. He must take them as he finds them, a dozen, a score, the more the better. From their variations, their vagaries, their caprices, their accidental shiftings and transformations, he is forced to extract the history of his story. Here is the place of the convention to which I have referred. Popular tales have a *way* of behaving: where we have scanty or no documentary evidence upon which to rely, we must trust to what might be called presumptive or probable evidence. We have definite evidence that such and such a tale behaved in such and such a way in its apparently aimless peregrinations through time and space. That evidence is collected and set forth in a certain monograph. Then we are fairly justified in feeling that such might have been the case with a similar tale which we happen to be studying. This inferential kind of evidence known to every folklorist will seldom be found mentioned in a monograph on popular tales;[1] it goes without saying, because it is a convention. Hence the skepticism among students of literature that a given point has been established. Where is the proof? We are dealing here with two different kinds of proof. Where the student of literature is able to point to a definitely dated document as his final evidence, the student of popular tales is compelled to base his inferences upon a chain of presumptive evidence, and many links in that chain are hidden in death's dateless night or are invisible to the uninitiated. No one would assert that

[1] But discussions will be found in Kaarle Krohn, *Die folkloristische Arbeitsmethode,* Oslo, 1926 (Institutet for sammenlignende kulturforskning).

Digitized by Google

one piece of presumptive evidence considered by itself is as trustworthy as an historical document; but many pieces, linked sufficiently closely together, may present convincing evidence of the dissemination of a tale, and of the life-history of that tale during the process. In its last analysis, the search for the life-history of a tale differs but little from the search for the source of a literary document. Hypotheses are built up on the basis of the available evidence in both cases.

In the present instance, the most easily available piece of evidence is the First Tale of the Eighth Day of Boccaccio's *Decameron.* In view of the close relationship of this tale with Chaucer's, it would be to our advantage to have both before us in full; but lack of space forces us to use a brief summary.

> A German soldier named Gulfardo borrows two hundred florins from Guasparruolo, a rich Milanese merchant, in order to give it to the merchant's wife, Ambruogia, in return for her favors; but he is so shocked at her cupidity that he resolves to humiliate her. The arrangement is that she will inform him when her husband is out of town, and he will come with only one friend, in whom he has confidence and who is always with him. When he arrives to keep the engagement, the soldier hands the money to the wife, saying, in the presence of the friend, "Madam, keep this and give it to your husband when he returns." She counts the money, still before the friend, and then grants her favors to the soldier. As soon as the husband returns, Gulfardo informs him that he has returned the money to Ambruogia. The merchant asks her in Gulfardo's presence whether that is the case, and she is compelled to acknowledge that he did pay the money to her, because of course Gulfardo has a witness.

Obviously, this is in all essentials the same story as the *Shipman's Tale;* yet it differs enough in several respects from Chaucer's version to invalidate it as a source. The fact that in Boccaccio the lover is a soldier, not a monk,

Digitized by Google

is of little consequence. The intimate relationship of the three principal characters is found in both. In Boccaccio the lover starts the love-talk, while in Chaucer the wife takes the initiative. The rage of the soldier at the wife's sordidness has no counterpart in Chaucer; in fact, Chaucer does not depict the wife as miserly or sordid in any way, but as just the reverse — she is extravagant, and wants the money for clothes. We know of no intention of the monk's to deceive the wife until after the deception is carried out. Boccaccio's soldier promises to bring "only one friend" with him when he fetches the money. Dan John has no such "friend". The Boccaccio story has increased the number of characters to four, apparently because of a need felt for motivation. Without this fourth character, Boccaccio's story would be lame indeed. This friend is present as a material witness both when the soldier gives the money to the wife, and when he tells the husband about giving it to her; he is therefore a principal character. In Chaucer we feel no need of a fourth person, as Chaucer has characterized the wife so fully as to supply *within her character* the place of the motivation which the fourth person in Boccaccio's story is used to supply. Here lies the main difference between the two tales. In other respects, the two are much alike, sufficiently alike to make it certain that they are closely related. In plot, Chaucer's is the more naïve of the two, in characterization the more complex. We do not miss the fourth character, or perceive the naïveté in Chaucer's plot, until we become acquainted with Boccaccio's. Chaucer's tale represents the minimum of plot and the maximum of characterization; Boccaccio's represents a more complicated plot and virtually no characterization at all. That Chaucer is working here as he usually works seems quite clear. His tendency in general seems to be to accept plots as he finds them, but to develop character as he sees fit. His technique in rehandling Boccaccio's

Digitized by Google

*Filostrato* in *Troilus and Criseyde* is a case in point: plot remains essentially the same, with characterization shifted and amplified to suit the author. Certainly, if we consider the matter exclusively on the basis of plot, the influence would seem to be rather from Chaucer to Boccaccio than from Boccaccio to Chaucer.

But there is yet further reason to believe that Chaucer did not borrow from Boccaccio for his plot of the *Shipman's Tale.* The reason lies in the answer to the question, Did Chaucer know the *Decameron?* Scholarly opinion has been divided on this question. Morsbach, the most prominent advocate of the affirmative, sets forth four parallels between the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Decameron:* (1) The stories of both works are told by the members of a company of persons. (2) The company in each work has come together not by chance, but with a common purpose. (3) The links connecting the stories in both works describe the actions of the company. (4) One member of the company in each work acts as director and judge of the story-telling.[1] The validity of these parallels, weak at best, was considerably lessened when Tatlock pointed out that they are equally applicable to the *Canterbury Tales* and Boccaccio's *Filocolo,* or to the *Canterbury Tales* and Boccaccio's *Ameto.* So far as we know, Chaucer had no acquaintance with either of these works.[2]

Root calls attention to a further likeness between the two works in that "both Boccaccio and Chaucer make formal apology for the freedom and coarseness of some of their tales, and defend the inclusion of these tales on precisely the same grounds, and in the same playful spirit of mock seriousness."[3] But these parallels — (1) the author

[1] *Englische Studien* XLII (1910) 43 ff.
[2] *Anglia* XXXVII (1913) 69 ff.
[3] *Englische Studien* XLIV (1912) 1 ff.

Digitized by Google

is merely a reporter, bound to relate the stories that were told, and not responsible for their character; (2) the squeamish reader is bidden skip the stories which give offense — it is not the author's fault if he choose amiss; (3) the author has given his readers ample warning by introductory matter as to the nature of each story before they read it — these parallels, as Cummings pertinently remarks,[1] are too much in the nature of coincidences to stand as valid evidence. Another discrepancy between the two works consists in the fact that Chaucer deliberately breaks with the contemporary conventions of polite literature by introducing characters of low station, so that "low" stories are appropriate.

The only other evidence pointing toward Chaucer's knowing the *Decameron* lies in the close resemblance between Chaucer's *Clerk's Tale* (Griselda) and *Decameron* X, 10, and between Chaucer's *Franklin's Tale* (the knight and his faithful wife) and *Decameron* X, 5. Cummings indicates that the first is unquestionably taken from Petrarch's Latin translation of Boccaccio's story, rather than from the *Decameron* itself, and that the second has so many analogues, shows so little dependence upon, and so many differences from Boccaccio's tale, that no case can be made out for Chaucer's dependence.[2]

We are therefore justified in accepting Cummings's conclusions that there is no evidence for Chaucer's having known any works of Boccaccio's save the *Filostrato* and the *Teseide*. Since Cummings's dissertation, howerer, a new discussion of the subject has appeared from the English

[1] *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio, University of Cincinnati Studies* X (1916) part 2, p. 178. Cf. J. L. Lowes, *Modern Philology* XV (1918) 129 ff.

[2] See Cumming's special study of the latter in the work named above, pp. 181—197.

Digitized by Google

Seminar of the University of Rostock.[1] The author shows an incomplete knowledge of the literature of her subject, and abuses the parallel passage argument throughout her paper. She seems to feel that piling up fifty insignificant parallels makes out a stronger case than five or ten of the same kind. One illustration will suffice to indicate her method. She has discovered a case of agreement between the two authors in that Frate Cipolla (*Dec.* VI, 10) is red-headed — *de pelo rosso* — and that Chaucer's pardoner (A 675) "hadde heer as yelow as wex!"[2]

It is evident that Chaucer did not get his plot for the *Shipman's Tale* from *Decameron* VIII, 1. A similar story is found in *Decameron* VIII, 2.

> The parson of Varlungo receives the favors of a woman of his parish, and leaves his cloak in pawn, to be redeemed with money. He afterwards borrows a mortar from her, which he returns, and demands his cloak, which he says he left only as a pledge for the mortar. She mutinies, but is forced by her husband to send back the cloak.

The first part of this story is clearly of the same type as the *Shipman's Tale,* and doubtless belongs to the same cycle

---

[1] Hertha Korten, *Chaucers literarische Beziehungen zu Boccaccio,* Rostock, 1920.

[2] W. Farnham (*England's Discovery of the Decameron, Publications of the Modern Language Association* XXXIX (1924) 123 ff.) reports that Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, the first Englishman known to have possessed a copy of Laurens de Premierfait's French translation of the *Decameron,* acquired it between 1414 and 1439. This is a negative kind of evidence, but in the present state of knowledge one cannot place the advent of the *Decameron* in England before 1414, after Chaucer's death. See also H. Hauvette, *Les plus anciennes traductions françaises de Boccace, Bulletin italien* vv. VII, VIII, IX (1907, 1908, 1909), and the same author's *De Laurentio de Primofato . . .,* Paris, 1903. Mario Praz, *Chaucer and the Great Italian Writers of the Trecento, Monthly Criterion* VI (1927) 18—39, 131—57, 238—42, has little pertinent to this discussion.

Digitized by Google

of tales. The last part, which must not long detain us, I think must have been added by some inventive story-teller, as it is too much of the *bon mot* class to be of genuinely popular origin. If it had been a part of the story which Chaucer used, we may be sure that he would have used it, too, because such a clever play on words is bound to live long in a tale. In general, however, it belongs to the more sophisticated versions of a tale rather than to the more primitive. The sententious expression, the nimble play upon words, does not savor of the tale-producing folk.

Of the score or more of tales which show direct borrowings from *Decameron* VIII, 1 and 2, I shall discuss only a few which seem more important for our purpose. Naturally, a plainly evident *verbatim* borrowing from Boccaccio will throw no light on the problems at issue. The presence of this great collection of tales squarely dominating the horizon of European story from the middle of the fourteenth century complicates tremendously the study of any tale which occurs there. In the nature of things, the majority of variants must be dated later than the middle of the fourteenth century, and therefore the mighty influence of Boccaccio must be reckoned with constantly. Since this influence was all-pervasive throughout the Renaissance, in which period many variants must be expected to occur, it will be necessary to discriminate as carefully as may be between the influence of *Decameron* VIII, 1 and 2, and whatever part of the history of the type that is independent of Boccaccio.[1]

[1] My principal bibliographical aid has been A. C. Lee, *The Decameron: Its Sources and Analogues*, London, 1909, pp. 246–252 (on *Decameron* VIII, 1 and 2). M. Landau, *Die Quellen des Dekameron*[2], Stuttgart, 1884, has little of value for this type. The editions of Johannes Bolte mentioned later have supplied valuable notes; and that generous scholar himself has graciously assisted

Digitized by Google

Most important of the versions which I wish to mention here is the 19th of the *Novelle* of Giovanni Sercambi, the relationship of which to Boccaccio has not been clearly pointed out before.[1] Here the names of the characters are changed, as well as the names of places (Guasparruola becomes Pircosso, Ambruogia becomes Madonna Sofia, the German lover-soldier Gulfardo becomes Messer Bernardo, Milan becomes Perugia, and Genoa becomes Ancona). But the significant thing for us to observe is that while the main action remains identically the same, Sercambi evidently felt the need for additional motivation, for when the soldier is borrowing the two hundred florins from the husband, he asks him whether he may not return the money to the wife if he should find no need for it during the husband's absence. The husband agrees, and the remainder of the story is identical with Boccaccio's. The existence of this tale supports my contention that the *Shipman's Tale* represents a more primitive version than *Decameron* VIII, 1, because we have a perfectly clear relationship existing between *Decameron* VIII, 1 and Sercambi no. 19, and within the limits of this perfectly clear relationship we find an additional complication added, *in the direction of more complete motivation.* Our story, then, has been altered before our very eyes in the direction in which I believe that its earlier development took place.

Of only passing interest is another imitation, La Fontaine's *A femme avare galant escroc,* in rhymed couplets,

---

in procuring elusive texts and in adding variants. Professors G. L. Kittredge and J. L. Lowes have lent encouragement and advice, as have Professors Kaarle Krohn and Stith Thompson. Professor Archer Taylor has been most helpful with advice and references, and Mr. George C. Vieh and Dr. E. J. Simmons have checked references for me.

[1] *Novelle inedite di Giovanni Sercambi, tratte dal Codice* Trivulziano CXCIII, por cura di Rodolfo Renier, Turin, 1889, pp. 81—84.



Digitized by Google

with La Fontaine's usual smoothness of measure and dexterity in co-ördinating subject-matter and form.[1] This rendering, often itself imitated, and identical to all intents and purposes with *Decameron* VIII, 1, Langbein's *Das Hammelfell* (see *post,* p. 29), and Chaucer's *Shipman's Tale* are the most highly polished literary versions of the Lover's Gift Regained type.[2]

In Germany the influence of the *Decameron* began very early through the translation of pseudo-Steinhöwel, the importance of which is indicated in one way by its date of printing, 1472.[3] That omnivorous snapper-up of literary odds and ends, Hans Sachs, was thoroughly familiar with pseudo-Steinhöwel, and versified this particular tale twice, as *Die petrogen puelerin,* and as *Die 200 Dukaten.*[4]

---

[1] *Oeuvres de La Fontaine,* ed. H. Regnier, Paris, 1887, IV, 357—365. The notes refer to Tallemant des Réaux, *Les historiettes*[3], edd. Monmerqué and P. Paris, Paris, 1857, VI, 66, *Madame d'Espagnet,* which is not an analogue. Charles Collé has a "proverbe dramatique" imitating this: *Recueil général des proverbes dramatiques,* London, 1785, I, 1—61.

[2] Somewhat similar in verse-form, although quite certainly again a direct borrowing from Boccaccio, is *La Muse Dauphine,* by Perdou de Subligny, "du 24 mars, 1667", in *Les continuateurs de Loret,* ed. J. Rothschild, Paris, 1882, II, coll. 753—755.

[3] The edition by Adelbert von Keller, Stuttgart, 1860 (*Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins,* LI), is now antiquated. Cf. H. Möller, *Arigo und seine Dekameron-übersetzung,* Leipzig (dissertation) 1895; Carl Drescher, *Arigo, der Übersetzer des Decamerone und des Fiore di virtu,* Strassburg, 1900 (*Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker,* LXXXVI); Julius Hartman, *Das Verhältnis von Hans Sachs zur sogenannten Steinhöwelschen Decameronübersetzung,* Berlin, 1912 (*Acta Germanica,* ed. Rudolf Henning, Neue Reihe, Heft 2). The history of Boccaccio's influence in Germany has yet to be written; but cf. Florence N. Jones, *Boccaccio and his Imitators in France* . . . etc., Chicago, 1908.

[4] *Die petrogen puelerin,* no. 700 in *Sämtliche Fabeln und Schwänke von Hans Sachs,* edd. E. Goetze and C. Drescher, Halle

Digitized by Google

An Italian rendering which again calls attention to the additional motivation which narrators of the tale in Italy seemed to feel necessary is found in the Fourth Day of *L'Arcadia in Brenta ovvero la melanconia sbandita,* by Ginnesio Gavardo Vacalerio.[1] There are three characters, the two men being neighboring merchants. The money is borrowed from the husband *in un sacchetto rosso,* and given to the wife in the same container, this bit of circumstantial evidence overcoming the reluctance of the avaricious wife to admit the receipt of the money.

Equally clear as a direct loan from the *Decameron* is a story in Charles Johnson's *Lives and Adventures of the Most Famous Highwaymen.*[2]

Much less direct, but still nevertheless an imitation, or, rather, an adaptation from the same tale, is the very ornate and highly elaborated effort of Happel, which is an intricately interwoven combination of *Dec.* VIII, 1 with the plot of a *fabliau* discovered and studied by Gaston Paris, and further examined by J. Bédier, *Le lai l'épervier.*[3] Two

---

a. S., 1904, V, 151 ff. (*Neudrucke deutscher Litteraturwerke des XVI. u. XVII. Jahrhunderts,* nos. 200—211), "Anno salutis 1551, am 24 tag Januarii", *Die 200 Dukaten,* no. 236 in VI, 311 ff. of the same collection, Halle a. S., 1913 (*Neudrucke,* nos. 230—245).

[1] Bologna, 1693, pp. 170—171. In another edition, that of Venice, 1785, the tale is on pp. 167—169. I have not seen the edition of 1674.

[2] London, 1734, pp. 79—81. The tale is repeated, textually altered here and there, in H. B. Marriott Watson's edition of *Lives of the Highwaymen,* London, n. d., Sisley's, Ltd., pp. 3—4. It is silently suppressed, although the "hero", Capt. Philip Stafford, has a biography, in the *Complete Newgate Calendar, being Captain Charles Johnson's General History of the Lives and Adventures of the Most Famous Highwaymen, Murderers, Street-Robbers* . . . etc., collated and edited . . . by J. L. Rayner and G. T. Crook, London, Navarre Society, 1926.

[3] *Der Akademische Roman, worinnen das Studenten-leben fürgebildet wird; Zusamt allem was auf den Universitäten passiret*

Digitized by Google

married couples, the husbands reciprocal cuckolds, and an unattached Italian rogue named Venereus, are the principal characters. The wife to whom Venereus makes the lover's gift is grasping and guileful, just as in Boccaccio, and the money is returned to the husband in the same manner.

Even further removed, but apparently still related, is the doggerel jingle in another German miscellany of a few years later.[1]

*Der undanckbare Franzos*

is about a Frenchman who takes twelve louis d'or to a merchant to be exchanged. The merchant being out, the Frenchman falls in love with the merchant's wife and gives her the money in return for her favors. The Frenchman

---

*wie diese bestellet werden wie die Professiones und Facultäten eingetheilet sind was desz Rectoris Magnifici, Decani, Professoren, Studenten Pedellen & c. Amt und Privilegia, wie und welcherley Gradus man conferiret wie viel Universitäten hohe und andere berühmte Schulen und Collegia jetzo in gantz Europa; Wann der Pennalismus abgeschaffet; Was für Excessen die Studenten offt begehen was die Bachanten für Leute und was man von dem Akademischen Leben zu wissen verlangen mag. Das Gute zur Lehre das Böse aber zur Warnung der Ehr-liebenden Jugend in einer schönen Liebes-Beschichte* (sic!) *fürgestellet von Everhardo Gverno Happelio,* Ulm, druckts und verlegts Math. Wagner 1690. In a modern edition, ed. R. Schacht, Berlin, 1913, much condensed, this tale is not included. On the *motif* of *Le lai l'épervier,* see Aarne-Thompson, *Types of the Folk-tale,* Helsingfors, 1928 (*Folklore Fellows Communications* 74), no. 1419D, *The Returning Husband Hoodwinked: The Lovers as Pursuer and Fugitive.*

[1] *Oel und Wein | Gegossen auff die Wunden der Lebendig-Toden | oder Curieuser Zeit-Vertreiber von allerhand lustigen u. wahrhafften Begebenheiten | mots à rire, Epigrammatibus, und zusammengeklaubten Einfällen, als eine heilsame Cur wider die Melancolie,* In deutlichen Teutschen Versen Monathlich herfürgebracht von Cristofero Friederici. Erste Spendage. Anno 1719. Franckfurt, zu finden in der Buch-Gassen. Friederici is a pseudonym for Johann Friedrich Riederer.

Digitized by Google

returns the next day and informs the husband that he left the money there for exchange. The husband exchanges it.

> "Die Frau dacht: Du Franzosen-Schinder |
> du teufflisch-abgefeimbter Dieb!
> Wie leicht käm jetzt der Mann dahinter |
> was ich dir hinters Ohre schrieb |
> soll ich nebst dem was dich kunt laben |
> dich Gratis auch tractiret haben?"

*Le grand parangon des nouvelles nouvelles,* a collection of indifferent quality chiefly noted for its abandonment of all discretion in the kind of "novels" collected, has a story

> D'un gallent qui bailla a une dame trente beaux escus faulx pour coucher avec elle et comment le fait fut avéré et fallut a la dame dire la verité.

The lover's gift is not regained, as the money given is counterfeit. If the story is within the type at all, it is a rather far-fetched "literary" adaptation of *Decameron* VIII, 1.[1]

Firenzuola tells a story which, again, is rather a remote adaptation of Boccaccio's tale, the plot of which is sufficiently indicated by the rubric:

> Don Giouanni ama la Tonia: et ella per promessa d'un paio di maniche li compiace; e perche egli non gne le da, ella d'accordo col marito il fi uenire in casa: e quiui gli fanno da se medesimo prendere la penitenza.

The wife is never complaisant, as in tales well within the type, but from the beginning has determined to humiliate the amorous monk. The sleeves are merely promised, never delivered, in somewhat the same way that the money is promised but not delivered in *Dec.* VIII, 2. The center of the story is not the lover's gift, which is never actually made, but the ruse by which the monk is caught by the husband of the woman.[2]

---

[1] No. 31, p. 126, of the edition by Emile Mabille, Paris, 1869.

[2] *Le novelle di M. Agnolo Firenzuola, Firentino,* nuouamente ristampate & reviste. In Venetia, . . . 1541, Ragionamenti, no. 4, pp. 22 ff., *Di prete Giovanni e della Tonia.* The *Ragionamenti* were finished in 1493. Cf. the French translation edited by Alcide Bon-

Digitized by Google

According to Albert Wesselski, a tale of the general type with which we are concerned "ist übrigens noch immer lebendig", in *Lustige Blätter*; but on examination the tale turns out to be almost certainly a modern journalese imitation of *Decameron* VIII, 1; one Sally Veilchenwurzel becomes infatuated with the wife of his neighbor Ruben Fensterriegel and finally prevails upon her to accept his attentions in return for fifty marks which she needs to meet an unpaid dressmaker's bill. The lover borrows the money from the husband, turns it over to the wife, and then informs the husband of the repayment just as in *Decameron* VIII, 1.[1]

*Decameron* VIII, 2 was more assiduously copied than its immediate predecessor, possibly because its play on words tickled the fancy of the tale-reading public. There can be little doubt that these copies are based on Boccaccio rather than on the possible original, the *Versus de mola piperis,* found in an early thirteenth-century manuscript at Trinity College, Cambridge:[2]

---

neau, *Les nouvelles de Agnolo Firenzuola,* Paris, 1881. Heinrich Gassner, *Englische Studien* XIX (1894) 454, is certainly wrong in deriving *The Old Wives Tale (The Cobler of Caunterburie, or an Invective against Tarlton's News out of Purgatorie . . . ,* London, 1608, fo. J3) from *Dec.* VIII, 1 and VIII, 8, in so far as VIII, 1 is concerned. Lee, *Decameron,* 252, refers to *Les divertissements curieux, ou le thresor des meilleurs rencontres et mots subtils de ce temps,* Lyons, 1654, p. 267: *Gageure de trois bons drôles à qui feroit son voisin cocu le plus subtilement,* which is not in the type, but belongs with *Les trois dames qui trouvèrent l'anneau* (Bédier, *Les fabliaux*[4], pp. 265 ff.).

[1] A. Wesselski's ed. of *Bebels Schwänke,* München and Leipzig, 1907, II, 116; *Lustige Blätter* XXI (1906), no. 39, p. 6: *Ein braver Mann.*

[2] Thomas Wright, *Essays on the Literature,* etc. *of the Middle* Ages, London, 1846, I, 67. A. Riese, *Anthologia latina,* Leipzig, 1870, II, p. xlv, points out that this verse is obviously non-classical and must belong to the later Middle Ages.

Digitized by Google

Militis uxorem clamidis mercede subegit
Clericus, et piperis clam tulit inde molam.
Mane redit, referensque molam praesente marito
Dixit: mantellum redde, reporto molam.
Redde maritus ait; respondit foemina: reddam:
Amplius ad nostram non molet ille molam.

As many are *verbatim* copyings of Boccaccio, I shall list them in a footnote. One which is of interest here is the story of the clever coachman, collected from the folk near Lemberg at about the beginning of the present century.[1]

Und ein reicher, steinreicher Herr wieder ("Ihr kennt ihn etwa, Gevatter?" fragt der Erzähler, zu einem Zuhörer gewendet) rüstet seinen Sohn aus zu einer Reise, die Welt kennen zu lernen, und gab ihm einen klugen Kutscher mit. Mit einem Viergespann fuhren sie nämlich. Dem Fuhrmann nun gab der alte Herr eine Börse voll Dukaten mit, ihm selber aber einige hundert Dukaten als Taschengeld für drei Monate. Und sie kamen in eine Stadt gefahren. Auf einer Freitreppe sahen sie eine feine, sehr schöne Frau stehen. Und da sagt er nun zu diesem Kutscher: "Wenn die mir gäbe, würd' ich ihr die Börse abtreten." — Und sie hört es und es überkam sie ein grosses Gelüste darnach. Und sie merkt auf, wo er einkehren wird, um ihn nicht aus den Augen zu verlieren, und so nach einer Weile schickte sie ihr Dienstmädchen zu dem Herrn, ihn zum Kaffee einzuladen. Und er kam. Sie fragt ihn, ob er sich entsinnt, was er gesagt hatte. Er ward etwas verlegen, denn er war ja noch jung. "Bitt' sich nicht zu genieren, 's wird alles gut sein, nur müssen's Wort halten." — "Ich darf mein Wort nicht zurücknehmen," sagt' er und schickte den Kutscher nach der Börse. Der Kutscher aber war gescheit: er gab sie ihm ohne den Schlüssel. Nun, und er stillte seine Liebeslust an ihr . . . Er kam zurück zum Kutscher und sagt: "Schirr' die Pferde

[1] V. Hnatjuk, *Das Geschlechtleben des ukrainischen Bauernvolkes,* Leipzig, 1912 (*Beiwerke zum Studium der Anthropophyteia,* V), no. 301: *Der kluge Kutscher.* "Erzählt in Kropyvnyk Novyj, Bezirk Drohobyč, von dem Schmied J. Važnyj, 1901." I owe this version to the kindness of Professor dr. Bolte.

Digitized by Google

an, wir kehren nach Hause zurück." Der Kutscher stutzte: "Ja, wie so denn? Wir fuhren für längere Zeit weg!" — Der Herr aber geht auf und ab mit verschlossener Miene. Er mochte noch sehr in seinen Herrn dringen, woran's ihm gebricht, — er will's nicht sagen. Endlich musste er's gestehen, wo die Börse hin ist, wofür sie hingegeben ward. Der Kutscher denkt eine Weile nach, dann sagt er: "Ich geh' zu dieser Frau, die Börse wird wieder uns gehören." — Nun, dann ist's gut!" — Da ging er zu ihr, einen Mörser ausleihen, um Pfeffer darin zu zerreiben, denn ein Gaul hatt' zu hinken begonnen, man müsst's kurieren. Und er kam mit dem Mörser und behielt ihn eine Zeitlang und passt auf, wann ihr Herr Gemahl nach Hause kommen wird. Und da kommt er und bringt den Mörser. — "Bitt' schön, Gnädige, ich bring' den Mörser da, dass ihr das Pfand zurückgebet." — Und der Herr darauf: "Wass ist's, was heisst denn das?" "Ei, mein Herr hat den Mörser ausgeliehen und die Börse als Pfand gelassen." — Da ward der Herr zornig, da von so einem Herrn kein Pfand für den Mörser genommen werde. Und da brachte sie nun diese Börse, sie hatt' sie gar nicht aufgemacht, da sie den Schlüssel dazu nicht hatte, und spricht mit schwerem Herzen: "Sagt eurem Herrn dort, er werde keine Pfeffer mehr in dem Mörser zerstossen."

This tale is given at length for the reason that it is the only one of the numerous imitations of *Decameron* VIII, 2 which can possibly lay claim to popular rather than literary origin. While at first glance this may appear an authentic folk-tale, with its coloring of folk simplicity and its general "popular" atmosphere, a moment's reflection indicates plainly that, although we have no reason to suspect the genuineness of the tale itself, we have every reason to believe that this is just as much a "literary" version as any of the others listed below. The boy servant of Boccaccio's priest of Varlungo here becomes the clever coachman, and the priest himself becomes the young student, but otherwise the stories are virtually identical. Save for the introduction of the locked purse, which makes the tale slightly more probable — since the contents of a locked purse cannot

Digitized by Google

be liquidated so quickly as money — the lover's gift is regained in precisely the same way as in Boccaccio, through the mortar ruse. Certainty is out of the question, but without other versions in support of this one, it is difficult to believe that this tale had really taken root among the peasantry in Poland. It is much more probable that this version is only one or two steps away from some lettered person who learned the tale from reading Boccaccio, and put it into circulation in much the same way that many of Chaucer's stories are kept current to-day.

The vogue of *Decameron* VIII, 2 in Germany makes it impossible to differentiate among copies based on the translation of pseudo-Steinhöwel and those based directly on Boccaccio; but as the popular German translation is a close rendering of the Italian, such differentiation is not of great importance. Thus, *Die pewrin mit dem mörser*, "In der abentewerweis des H. Folz," written in 1545 by Hans Sachs, may be from either original, although it would seem that the German translation was the more accessible.[1]

[1] No. 237 in *Sämtliche Fabeln und Schwänke von Hans Sachs,* edd. E. Goetze and C. Drescher, Halle a. S., 1900, III, 422 ff. (*Neudrucke,* nos. 164—176). In the first volume of the same edition (*Neudrucke,* nos. 110—124, 1893), no. 80, pp. 241 ff., *Der pfarrer mit dem korock* is identical with the one just cited, even to the date, "Anno salutis 1545, am 22 tag Septembris," save for trifling variations in spelling. In the Stadtbibliothek at Nürnberg there is a version in the Solger MSS. 56. 2°, ff. 326 v. and 327, dated 1557, "Jnn der Abentheuer weis folzen. Die beurin mit dem mörser," which is also identical with the two above-named of Sachs. The close relationship of the three may be perceived by a glance at the first four lines of each:

Sachs, no. 237:

Ein pfarer in eim dorfe sas,
Derselb gar seicht geleret was.
Derselb ein pewrin lieb gewan,
Die het ein ainfeltigen man.

Digitized by Google

Sachs, no. 80:

Ein pfarer auf eim dorffe sas,
Der auch gar seiht geleret was.
Der selb ain pewrin lieb gewon,
Die het ain ainfeltigen mon.

Solg. MSS. 56. 2°:

Ein Pfarer in ein dorffe sas
der selb gar seicht gelehret was
der selb ein Beurin lieb gewan
die hett ein einfeltigen man.

Similarly, it would seem that four other close imitations of *Dec.* VIII, 2 are one and the same. The first occurs in the *Esopus* of Burkhard Waldis, 1555, IV, 27 (I have not seen the edition of 1548; standard ed. by Heinrich Kurz, Leipzig, 1862, II, 80 ff., notes, II, 159 ff. A. L. Stiefel, *Studien zur vergleichenden Litteraturgeschichte* III (1903) 495, rejects on tenuous grounds the dependence of this tale on *Dec.* VIII, 2); the second, a *meisterlied* by B. von Watt, written in 1592, is printed by J. Bolte in his ed. of *Martin Montanus Schwankbücher,* Tübingen, 1899, pp. 541 ff.; the third is in the Solger MSS. S6. 2°, ff. 355 v, 356, 356 v, in the Stadtbibliothek at Nürnberg; and the fourth (F. W. Zachariae, *Fabeln und Erzählungen in Burkhard Waldis Manier,* neue Ausgabe, Braunschweig, 1777, *Anhang einiger Fabeln und Erzählungen von Burkhard Waldis,* pp. 70—73) turns out to be a *verbatim* copy of Waldis. All four of these begin "Im Beierland zu Ingolstadt." Bolte mentions a fifth, which I have not seen, in his edition of Frey's *Gartengesellschaft* (1556), Tübingen, 1896, p. 242, in a Weimar ms. quarto 571, f. 329 a.

*Aduenture* 20, *D'un escolier qui donna sa robbe à une ieune Apothicaresse d'Orleans, pour iouyr de son amytié, et comment il eust sa robbe,* in *Les ioyeuses aduentures et plaisant facetieux deuis fort recreatif, pour reiouyr tous espritz melancoliques,* Lyons, 1555, returns to *Dec.* VIII, 2, of which it is a close copy. It in turn was literally translated by Hans Wilhelm Kirchhof in his *Wendunmuth* (1601) III, no. 176, *Ein studiosus verbult sein rock;* see the ed. by H. Oesterley, Stuttgart, 1869, II, 449 ff. Oesterley's citation of Ernst Wohlgemuth, *500 frische und ergötzliche Haupt-Pillen,* s. l., 1669, III, 170, no. 43, *Ein Geistlicher überlistet* is not pertinent for this type. The Italian *novella* or its German translation is again used as the basis for no. 102 in J. Bolte's ed. of *Martin Montanus Schwankbücher,* p. 299, *Ein pfaff beschlafft eins*

Digitized by Google

From the tales already mentioned, the essential characteristics of the Lover's Gift Regained type emerge thus: a lady's favors can be won only through a gift, which the lover regains from her through a trick of some sort.

Before passing on to a consideration of other analogues of the *Shipman's Tale,* it will be well to notice a

*baurn weib, gibt ihr seinen chorrock zu pfand, betreugt sie darnach, das er ihm wider würt* (cf. the review of this ed. by A. L. Jellinek, *Literarisches Zentralblatt* for June, 1901, col. 898), as also is the case with the following: *Michael Lindeners Rastbüchlein* (1558), ed. Franz Lichtenstein, Tübingen, 1883, no. 26, *Wie ein pfaff frawen Belcora beschlafft, umb des willen ir ein korrock zu pfandt lasst,* where the name of the wife is very close to Boccaccio's *Belcolore;* MS. poet. 2° 21 of the Landesbibliothek in Cassel, *Schmahl vnndt kahl Roldmarsch Kasten, Neun vnndt neuntzig auserlesener, lustiger vnndt zu schwerer Zeit kurtzweiliger Historien,* etc., by Diedrich Mahrold, 1608, no. 73, ff. 285a—293a, *Von einem Dorffpfaffen im Landt zu Francken, da vmb eine glatte Bäwerin buhlt, welcher er dann auch gute Bossen macht vndt druber sein Chor-Rock verbletzt, vndt wie er den letzlich wieder bekahm;* Otho Melander, *Jocorum atque sèriorum,* Frankfurt, 1626, III, 502 ff., no. 403, *De quodam a vicina sua mortarium* (not in the editions of 1568, 1611, 1617; I have not seen the ed. of 1643); *De Geest van Jan Tamboer,* I—III *Deel,* Amsterdam, 1664, p. 153: *Herdige Klucht van een Barbier, en een Apotheckers Vrouwe,* which is twice translated independently into German, (1) in *Der Geist von Jan Tambour,* s. l. et a., p. 137: *Von einem Barbierer und eines Apotekers Frauen,* (2) in *Der Kurtzweilige . . . Arlequin . . ,* Leipzig, 1691, p. 476: *Die hintergegangene Ehebrecherinn.* The last direct imitation of *Dec.* VIII, 2 which I have to notice is again in German, in the *Vade mecum für lustige Leute . . . ,* 3. Theil, p. 193, no. 237: *Die betrogene Bauersfrau* (1767). As Lee, *Decameron,* p. 252, observes, the rapprochement made between *Dec.* VIII, 2, and *Le quattro parti de le novelle del Bandello* (ed. G. Balsamo-Crivelli, Torino, 1910, II, 358 ff.) in *Bibliografia Boccaccesca,* ed. Alberto Bacchi della Lega, Bologna, 1875, p. 155, is unsound. This list of almost literal adaptations of only one of the hundred tales of the *Decameron* will give some idea of the magnitude of the task of estimating the influence of this important collection of stories in Germany.

Digitized by Google

suggestion made by Grässe that *Le bouchier d'Abbeville,* a *fabliau,* is the source of the *Shipman's Tale.* Similarly, Du Méril thought that it is the source of *Decameron* VIII, 1.[1] That neither is the case a brief summary of the *fabliau* will suffice to demonstrate.

> A butcher asks lodging of a priest, who refuses him abusively. As he proceeds down the road, the butcher passes a flock of sheep which he learns belong to the priest. Stealing one, he returns to the priest's house and offers the sheep's carcass in return for a night's lodging, on the condition that he be given the skin in the morning. The proffer of the fat sheep alters matters, and the butcher is treated to a rich supper by the priest and his *amie.* The rogue sleeps with the servant-girl by promising her the sheep-skin. The next morning, while the priest is away celebrating early mass, the butcher obtains the favors of the priest's mistress by promising to give the sheep-skin to *her.* Then he proceeds to the church, where he tells the priest that he has changed his mind about wanting the sheep-skin, and he offers to sell it to him for two *sous.* The priest pays him, and the butcher goes on his way rejoicing, leaving the priest, his maidservant, and his mistress to settle the dispute over the ownership of the skin of the priest's own sheep.

This *fabliau,* of highly complicated plot, spins out the tale, giving us several animated scenes, for nearly six

---

[1] J. G. T. Grässe, *Lehrbuch einer allgemeinen Litterär-Geschichte,* Dresden and Leipzig, 1836—1859, II. Abteilung, 2, p. 1034; cf. Wilhelm Hertzberg, *Geoffrey Chaucers Canterbury-Geschichten,* Hildburghausen, 1866, p. 643 (re-ed. John Koch, with notes by J. Bolte, Berlin, 1925; only *Dec.* VIII, 1 mentioned); *Le bouchier d'Abbeville* is printed in the *fabliau* collections of Barbazan-Méon, Paris, 1808, IV, 1 ff., Montaiglon and Raynaud, Paris, 1872—90, III, 227 ff., and Le Grand d'Aussy[3], Paris, 1828, III, 288 ff. For Du Méril's opinion, see *Les sources du Decameron et ses imitations,* in his *Histoire de la poesie scandinave,* Paris, 1839, p. 355. But cf. Bédier, *Les fabliaux*[4], p. 449, with references. Types 1731 and 1544 in Aarne-Thompson, *Types of the Folk-tale,* Helsingfors, 1928 (*FF Communications 74*) seem only vaguely similar to the *fabliau;* but cf. *post,* pp. 50 ff.

Digitized by Google

hundred lines. It is one of the few *fabliaux* of known authorship, having been written by Eustache d'Amiens. The story is much more elaborate here than in the other two tales, and it is obvious that the author devoted a good deal of effort to its composition. While it is beyond question that this is basically within the Lover's Gift Regained type, it is also beyond question that it could not be the source of either Chaucer's or Boccaccio's contribution, because the plot is far in advance, in so far as complication is concerned, of the very simple one of the *Shipman's Tale*, and of the less simple one of *Decameron* VIII, 1. In view of the high quality of this work of Eustache d'Amiens, it is not surprising to know that the work enjoyed some popularity, surviving in no less than three manuscripts.[1] It has an independent subsequent history of its own, as it was turned into German prose late in the eighteenth century by A. G. Meissner, and thence into smooth quatrains by A. F. E. Langbein, who was in turn imitated by Fritz Hönig in Lotterbove-Streich (Köln, s. a.).[2]

Some early variants of the Lover's Gift Regained type are in an Indian collection of "frame-stories", the *Çukasaptati,* "Seventy Tales of a Parrot", of which the date, like that of the majority of Oriental collections, is uncertain, but in all likelihood precedes 1330, and possibly is many centuries earlier.[3] The thirty-fourth tale provides a possible archetype for the cycle of stories in which we are interested.

[1] Two in Paris and one in Pavia. See A. Mussafia, *Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Klasse,* LXIV (Vienna, 1870) 545 ff.

[2] Meissner, *Skizzen,* 9. Sammlung, Carlsruhe, 1792, pp. 304 ff.; Langbein, *Sämtliche Schriften,* Stuttgart, 1835–37, II, 7 ff. Cf. H. Jess, *August Friedrich Ernst Langbein und seine Verserzählungen,* München, 1902, p. 42, and, for Hönig, which I have not seen, p. 47.

[3] The German translation which I use is *Das indische Papageienbuch,* by Richard Schmidt, München, 1913. There is a fragmentary English translation by B. H. Wortham, *The Enchanted*

Digitized by Google

Einst lebte in irgendeiner Stadt ein Brahmane mit Namen Sambhu. Dem Spiele ergeben und an verschieden Orten herumtreibend ging er des Weges, als er eine Feldhüterin erblickte, ein schönes Mädchen. Der gab er Betel und sprach unter freundlichen Worten: "Nimm dies mein Gewand, um mich zu geniessen, und treibe mit mir Wollust." So gewährte sie ihm die Wonne. Als er sein Geschäft besorgt hatte, verlangte er das Kleid von ihr zurück . . . Als er sie darum gebeten hatte, machte sie sich auf dem Heimweg. Da nahm er fünf Ähren, folgte ihr auf dem Fusse nach und schlug Lärm, als er das Dorf erreicht hätte: "Ach, seht, ihr Dorfältesten: in diesem Dorfe ist ein grosses Wunder geschehen: um fünf Ähren halber hat diese hier mir mein Kleid abgenommen!" — Da gaben die Dörfter es ihm wieder; sie aber aus Scham sagte nichts.

The individual story which seems most closely related to Sambhu's is *Decameron* VIII, 2. It will be noted that the lover regains his gift of a cloak in both by means of a ruse in which there are two shades of meaning. Neither a cloak nor money is the *quid pro quo* in the thirty-fifth of the *Çukasaptati,* where a grain-merchant is the husband.

Einst lebte in irgendeinem Dorfe ein Kaufmann mit Namen Sambata, ein Sesamhändler. Der ging nach dem Dorfe Sara in das Haus des dort wohnenden Getreidemeisters, der war nicht zu Hause, wohl aber seine Frau, die sehr leichtfertig war. Da entstand zwischen ihnen durch Augensprache Liebe; und er genoss sie dort, nachdem er ihr seinen Ring gegeben hatte. Nach Beendigung des Beischlafes wünschte er diesen Ring wieder . . . Als der Sesamhändler ihn nicht bekam, sprach er zu dem auf dem Markte befindlichen Getreidemeister: "Gib mir die hundert Mass Sesam, wie ich

*Parrot,* London, 1911, which seems popular. Richard Schmidt has edited the original texts: "textus simplicior" in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* LIV (1900) 515 ff.; "textus ornatior" in *Abhandlungen der Philosophisch-Philologischen Classe der königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* XXI (1901) 317 ff. For discussion of date, see Schmidt's translation, *passim,* especially pp. ix—xi.

Digitized by Google

abgeschlossen habe." So angeredet entgegnete jener: "Was für Sesam? Wer bist du Sprecher? Und wie war die Verabredung?" Er antwortet: "Bei dem Abschluss hat deine Frau mit doppeltem Nutzen auf das Mass meinen Ring genommen." — Da sandte der Kaufmann wütend seinen Sohn zu seiner Frau und liess sagen: "Durch solche Geschäfte, wie du sie machst, wird unser Haus zugrunde gehen!" Der Sohn brachte den Ring und gab ihn dem Sesamkäufer; der ging seiner Wege.

The light o' love wife, the claim made by the lover to the husband that a bargain has been consummated, the wrath of the husband at the wife's casual manner in business affairs, are here just as they are in later versions.[1]

The thirty-eighth tale in the same collection is particularly interesting inasmuch as it represents a well-defined Oriental group which has been re-collected from the folk only recently.

Here again we have the unscrupulous wife of a merchant, this time acceding to the desires of a Brahmin quartered in her home, after he has given her a ring. When the wife refuses to return it, the Brahmin, taking part of the bedstead with him, goes to the husband crying aloud that because he has broken the bed, the merchant's wife has taken his ring from him. The merchant restores the ring, angrily chiding the wife.

---

[1] It is interesting to note that in both collections these very similar tales follow one another. It would be hazardous to conjecture that Boccaccio had seen the Oriental collection. Not within our type, but notable as having some of its features, is a story in the Marathi translation of the *Çukasaptati,* ed. Richard Schmidt, *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* X (1897) 43 ff., no. 70.

The wife of a Brahmin receives as the price of her favors two *sér* of gold, out of which she proposes to have jewelry made. But the goldsmith suspects that she has received it through no honest means, and tells her when she returns that her husband has called for it and insisted on having it back. The wife has no recourse, and the goldsmith rejoices in his wind-fall.

Digitized by Google

Again we find the lover regaining his gift through a ruse; and this time the ruse involves carrying away something from the home of the wife, as in *Decameron* VIII, 2. In Boccaccio's story a different ruse is employed, but, although Boccaccio had more than a dozen close copyists of his story, there are really only two versions of it, his own and the *Versus de mola piperis,* while of this older one we have no less than five well-attested, independent variants. Thus we see that Boccaccio's treatments of the type are not the only ones with which we must reckon in considering the subsequent history of the Lover's Gift Regained.

The oldest of these five variants, and also the oldest version of this type thus far discovered, comes from twelfth-century Arabia. It is cited by O. Rescher from the Kitāb el -adkijā' of Ibn el-Gauzi.[1]

> A poet obtains the kisses of a woman by giving her a beautiful cloak. Regret at losing it inspires a scheme for its recovery. He asks for water. When it is brought, he drops the glass as if by accident. When the woman's husband returns, he finds the poet weeping on his door-step. "Your wife", he laments, "took my cloak from me because I broke a glass." The husband storms into the house and compels the wife to return the garment.

Essentially the same is the conclusion of a tale from fourteenth-century Persia, in which the gift is two fish which have been given to a young son to sell.[2]

The lover is a court fool, and the woman is the wife of the Grand Vizir, in the sixteenth-century Arabian *Jardin parfumé du Cheikh Nefzaoui.*[3]

[1] *Der Islam* XIV (1925) 402.

[2] A. Christensen, *Acta Orientalia* III (1924) 9. Professor Bolte referred me to this version. Rescher, as above, suspects that the tale which he reports may be the source of this one.

[3] The French edition which I use was published at Paris in 1886. Cf. A. Bonneau, *Curiosa,* Paris, 1887, and (English translation) *The Perfumed Garden for the Soul's Delectation,* Paris and Benares, 1907, pp. 155—206. The story is much elaborated with erotic detail.

Digitized by Google

Bahloul, the fool, has been given a valuable cloak by his master the Caliph. The wife of the Grand Vizir sees him with it, and is possessed with desire to own it. The buffoon is easily persuaded to part with it in return for her favors, and gets it back by demanding water, breaking the cup, and hanging about the steps until the return of the Grand Vizir, who restores the cloak to him when he hears the story which Bahloul has fabricated.

The latest variant of this group with which I am acquainted was collected in Morocco in 1889, where it was related of a notorious and versatile poet and sinner named Abu Nowas.[1]

Harun-al-Rashid one day gave Abu Nowas a fur coat. As he passed through the streets with it, the wife of a Vizir looked out and noticed it. Calling him in, she bargained, giving him a kiss in return for it. As he left, it occurred to him that the Sultan would want to know what had become of the new coat he had given him. He asked for a glass of water, and, breaking it, told the Vizir that his wife had therefore taken his coat from him. The servant assured the Vizir that Abu Nowas was not in his right mind, but nevertheless the husband forced the return of the coat.

---

[1] Hans Stumme, *Tunisische Märchen und Gedichte,* Leipzig, 1893, II, 121 ff., no. 11, *Der Pelz;* cf. the review by von Eckart, *Deutsche Rundschau* XC (1897) 126, and Martin Hartmann, *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde* V (1895) 61. This is the Abu Nowas of the *Thousand and One Nights;* cf. Chauvin, *Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes . . .*, Liège, 1895—1922, VI, pp. 140—141, no. 296, where most of the references are not to this particular tale, but to other events, historical and otherwise, which were attached to the name and fame of this jovial man about town. For a brief summary of some of the evidence for the unsavory reputation of Abu Nowas, see *The Encyclopedia of Islam,* edd. M. T. Houtsma, T. W. Arnold, *et al.,* Leyden and London, 1913, s. v. The story of Philesitherus (Apuleius, *The Golden Ass,* IX), listed by Chauvin, has, like the stories immediately preceding and following it, too few resemblances to be included in this type. There is no lover's gift, and the ruse, also, differs widely.



Digitized by Google

There can be little question that the tale was attracted to the reputation of Abu Nowas from the *Jardin parfumé* version. For one thing, we find the maid-servant accusing Abu Nowas of mental unsoundness; Bahloul *is* the court fool, and such an accusation fits him better than it does Abu Nowas, who certainly had a keen mind; for another, in both cases the woman is the wife of a Vizir; the ruse is identical in both, and the result is the same in both.

Unquestionably these five tales constitute a distinct group, since they are confined largely to the Orient, and since their dissemination is relatively easy to understand. But we find some difficulty in making connections with the group of tales which seems most closely related to this one, which for convenience I shall call the "glass of water" group. This other group has for its home not the Orient but Holland. I am quite unprepared to say how the transition between these two apparently closely-related groups took place. I cannot even maintain that a transition did take place; but although there are too few variants to permit of definite statement, I believe that the evidence of the plot itself is so convincing that the independent development of these two groups of tales is scarcely to be thought of.

The earliest version of this new group occurs in the *Antwerpener Liederbuch,* the oldest Dutch collection of ballads (1544).[1]

---

[1] *Souterliedekens,* ed. Elizabeth Mincoff-Marriage, The Hague, 1922, pp. 42 ff., no. 19. Also in J. F. Willems, *Oude Vlaemsche Liederen,* Ghent, 1848, pp. 270 ff., no. 113, *Loos tegen Loos; Antwerpener Liederbuch vom Jahre 1544,* ed. Hoffmann von Fallersleben as Part II of *Horae Belgicae,* Hanover, 1855, no. 35 (the Dutch ballad referred to in Mone's *Anzeiger für Kunde der teutschen* Vorzeit VI (1837) col. 170, is not in the type); the same work re-edited by D. F. Scheurleer, The Hague, 1889, pp. 316 ff.; L. Erk and F. M. Böhme, *Deutscher Liederhort,* Leipzig, 1893—94, I, 40 ff.; L. Huydecoper, *Proeve van Taal- en Dichtkunde in*

Digitized by Google

A peasant, delivering a load of wood at the home of a gentleman, is taken with the fine appearance of the man's wife —

"Mochtic een corte wijl by u sijn
Ic ghaf mijn ros, mijn waghen."

The wife holds him to the bargain and locks up the horse and wagon; but wisdom comes with experience, and the peasant wanders about, wailing,

"Ic segghe dat deen als dander es:
Mi rouwt mijn ros mijn waghen."

The gentleman comes home from hunting and inquires what he means. He replies that in the load of wood which he brought there was one rotten piece, and because of that the wife has confiscated his horse and wagon, although

"Ec seg dat het crom als trechte brant,
Als by het vier can comen."

The gentleman is enraged at his wife, and sharply orders her

"Gheef hem sijn ros, sijn waghen weer,
Laet hem varen to sijn kinderen."

---

*vrijmoedige Aanmerkingen op Vondels . . . Ovidius,* Amsterdam, 1730, III, 67 ff. (omitted in the second edition, Leyden, 1782—88). Oskar L. B. Wolff, *Halle der Völker,* Frankfurt a. M., 1857, II, 164 ff., reprints (translates?) from an "Altes fliegendes, zu Haag gedrucktes Blatt aus meiner Sammlung." It is interesting to note that this ballad was sufficiently in the public eye to justify its being turned into a *contrafactum* for religious edification shortly after it appeared in *Souterliedekens.* In Nürnberg, ca. 1554, was published separately *Ein Schön New geistlich Lied, Vom Geistlichen Ackermann.* "Aus dem pfiffigen, lusternen Bauer, der gelegentlich eines Holzverkaufes bei einer schönen Stadtfrau ein galantes Liebesabenteuer erlebt, wird der geistliche Ackersmann Jesus Christus, der sich selbst an den Wagen gespannt hat und bis zum Tode gezogen hat, ohne doch Ross und Wagen zu haben." — Kurt Hennig, *Die geistliche Kontrafaktur im Jahrhundert der Reformation,* Halle, 1909, p. 28, no. 36, and p. 283.

Digitized by Google

From this ballad Samuel Coster took the plot for his *Boereklucht van Teeuwis de Boer* (1627), a play in five acts and twelve scenes, with the motto

'T Krom hout brandt soo vel alst recht,
alst by de vyer ken komen.'

Thirty years later de Memel repeated the tale, followed by the anonymous editor of a similar collection in 1670.[1]

The close relationship between England and Holland in the seventeenth century is no doubt responsible for the reappearance of this story in Captain Alexander Smith's *Lives of Highwaymen,* published in London in 1714, as an incident in the life of Nicholas Wells, "A Murderer and Foot-Pad", who, turning to honest labor during a lull in his usual occupation, experiences identically the same adventure while driving a woodmonger's cart in Southwark. Having turned over his cart and horses to the gentlewoman, the same light dawns upon him as upon the Dutch peasant, and he falls to muttering "They are all alike." "What are all alike?", inquires the husband, overhearing Nick as he comes home to dinner. "The faggots," Nick replies. The husband reproves his wife for confiscating the cart and horses, and has them restored to the erstwhile highwayman.[2]

The most recent version of the "horse and wagon" group was collected in nineteenth-century Lithuania. It has the characteristics of the sixteenth-century Dutch prototype, and adds nothing of importance to it. In all probability

[1] *Samuel Costers Werken,* ed. R. A. Kollewijn, Haarlem, 1883, pp. 9—70; J. P. de Memel, *Lustige Gesellschaft: Comes facundus in via pro vehiculo: Allen Reissenden auch in Gesellschaft anwesenden Herren und Freunden zu Ehren und Lust aus vielen andern Büchern zusammengesucht* . . . Gedruckt zu Zippelzerbst im Drömbling. Im Jahr MDCLVII, p. 402, no. 73; *Lieblicher Sommer-Klee und anmuthiges Winter-Grün,* s. l., 1670, p. 183, no. 333.

[2] II, 75 ff., ed. of 1719, I, 276 ff. Reprinted in the ed. of Arthur L. Hayward, London, 1926, pp. 173 ff.

Digitized by Google

it was carried to Lithuania in a German translation of the Dutch.[1]

Just as it is impossible to discern the precise connection between the glass of water group and the horse and wagon group, because of a paucity of variants, so, for the same reason, it is not easy to conjecture just what happened between the "central" group of tales — *Çukasaptati* 34, *Shipman's Tale, Decameron* VIII, 1, and Sercambi no. 31 — and what I shall call the accidental discovery group, the earliest of which in date is a German prose tale by Heinrich Kaufringer from about the beginning of the fifteenth century.[2]

> A young poverty-stricken knight is overtaken by descending night. He comes to a castle from the tower of which a light is shining. In the garden he sees a lady, walking up and down and bewailing her toothache. As a matter of fact, she is awaiting her lover. The young knight enters the garden through an open gate, is welcomed by the lady, and receives the favor which had been reserved for the lover. Too late the lady perceives her mistake, and asks

[1] Lithuanian text edited by C. Capeller, *Zwölf Pasakos aus dem preussichen Südlitauen, Indogermanische Forschungen* XXXI (1912/13), 429—31, no. 3, *Vėnà tokė kaip kità;* cf. N. van Wijk, *Het Motief van "Teeuwis de Boer" in een litause "Pasaka", Tijdschrift voor nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde* XLI (1922) 246—48.

[2] Karl Euling, *Studien über Heinrich Kaufringer,* Breslau, 1900, pp. 65 ff. (*Germanistische Abhandlungen* XVIII). A. L. Jellinek (*Euphorion* IX [1902] 157 ff. — valuable comparative notes) accepts *Decameron* VIII, 1 and 2 as the originals of this tale. The reading of the three is sufficient to disprove this. For a discussion of the story type in which the lady's toothache is used as a blind, see the notes to the *Lai de l'Aüstic* in *Die Lais der Marie de France*[3], edd. Warnke, Köhler, and Bolte, Halle, 1925, CXLIX ff. Parallel only in that the husband's friend is the lover, while the lover himself is unaware of the identity of the lady's husband, is *Ritter- und Frauentreue,* no. 2, pp. 9 ff. (notes pp. 187—88) in A. Wesselski, *Märchen des Mittelalters,* Berlin, 1925. For substituted bridegroom, cf. Aarne-Thomson, *Types of the Folk-tale* (FF *Communications* 74) 403 IV B.

Digitized by Google

the knight for a keepsake. He has nothing but sixty gulden, which he hands over to her. In return she gives him a ring, and returns to the castle, calling to her husband, who has been waiting in the tower with the light, that her toothache has abated. The young knight accidentally meets the lady's husband, who is unknown to him, a few days later, and relates the incident. The husband of course recognizes the circumstances, and invites the young knight to visit him. While the husband, the lady, and the young knight are at dice, the husband compels the lady to fetch the sixty gulden. She has already recognized her ring on the young knight's finger, and there is considerable tension. The husband divides the sixty gulden in three parts, and they play for the money. Finally, after much entreaty by both wife and young knight, the husband pardons them both.

Next in date in this group is no. 45 of the *Novellino* of Masuccio Salernitano, where the ending is tragedy instead of comedy.[1]

The wife here, as in many of the Italian variants of the type, is miserly. She requires a thousand ducats of a young student before she will accede to his wishes. He pays her the money, all he has, and wanders about the country reduced to the condition of a servant. By chance he lodges at the same hotel as the lady's husband, who is returning from a journey. The young man finds the husband congenial, and finally tells the whole story of his loss. The husband does not reveal his identity, but offers to help the

[1] *Il Novellino di Masuccio Salernitano,* ed. Luigi Settembrini, Naples, 1874, no. 45, pp. 468 ff.; comparative notes by G. Amalfi, in *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde,* LX (1899) pp. 33 ff., 136 ff., who mentions *Pecorone,* 1, 2, which is not in our type. The first edition appeared in 1476 (see introduction, p. iv). An almost literal translation of this version is to be found in *Les comptes du monde adventurieux,* Paris, 1555 (ed. of Felix Frank, Paris, 1878, vol. II, pp. 1 ff.). A very similar one, doubtless based upon Masuccio, is no. 55 of the *Grand parangon des nouvelles nouvelles,* by Nicolas de Troyes, first published in 1536 (ed. E. Mabille, Paris, 1869, pp. 289 ff. Mabille claims in his introduction, p. vii, that nos. 46 and 55 contain the story of real happenings or of popular tales gathered by the author.)

Digitized by Google

young man get his money back, providing he will lead him to the scene of his troubles. The young man does so, and the husband compels the wife to repay all but one ducat, the proper recompense of a prostitute. The husband then dismisses the student with cautions regarding future amorous experiments, and poisons the wife.

Claus Spaun's *Ain gar schöner Spruch von aim, der soltt ain Doctor werden, wie er sein Geltt verthett* (1524—1526) is complicated by the addition of several factors, but nevertheless lies within this group, as the medical student pays all of his money to the *bürgerinn* for her favors, and has it returned to him by her husband, whom unwittingly he has told of the *nuit d'amour* with the *bürgerinn.*[1]

Another group which is not clearly articulated with those already mentioned is illustrated by the *Anser venalis* of Poggio Bracciolini's jest-book. Although the lover's gift is not returned in every instance, the wife's bargain is defeated in one way or another.[2]

---

[1] F. H. A. von Keller, *Erzählungen aus altdeutsche Handschriften,* Stuttgart, 1855, pp. 334 ff. On the manuscript, see F. H. A. von Keller, *Verzeichnis altdeutscher Handschriften,* ed. E. Sievers, Tübingen, 1890, pp. 195 ff.; L. Uhland, *Alte hoch- und niederdeutsche Volkslieder,* Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1844, vol. II, p. 973; Philipp Wackernagel, *Bibliographie des deutschen Kirchenliedes im XVI. Jahrhundert,* Frankfurt a. M., 1855, p. 80, no 215.

[2] *Pogii Florentini facetiarum libellus unicus,* London, 1798, I, 76, notes II, 65. Cf. A. Semerau, *Die Schwänke und Schnurren des Poggio,* Leipzig, 1905, pp. 69 ff., no. 69, notes p. 216. Semerau (216) is wrong in calling *Nouveaux contes à rire,* 1709 (Roger Bon-Tems), p. 75, *Subtilité d'un homme pour faire declaré son voisin cocu par lui-même,* an analogue (ed. of Paris, 1781, II, 158 ff. I have not seen the ed. of 1702); Lee, p. 252, is correct in seeing only a vague resemblance. Antoine Le Metel, Sieur d'Ouville, *Elite de contes,* Rouen, 1699, part 2, p. 136, *D'un homme qui fit declarer . . .* etc., is the same as the above, as is *Roger Bontemps en belle humeur,* Cologne, 1670, pp. 96 ff. (ed. Cologne, 1731, I, 82 ff.), *Subtilité d'un homme* etc. I have not seen Mérard

Digitized by Google

Rusticum adolescentem, qui Florentiae anserem deferebat venalem, conspicata mulier, quae sibi faceta videbatur, ridendi hominis gratia, rogavit, quanti Anserem faceret. At ille quod facillime, inquit, solvas. — Quid est, inquit mulier? — Vinco, ait ille, coitu. — Jocaris, respondit Mulier, sed domum ingredere, et de pretio convenietur. Ingressus domum cum perstaret in sententia, Mulier pretio annuit: Verum cum superiores partes egisset, petito ansere, Rusticus negat se daturum; non enim se Mulierem subagitasse, sed se ab ea compressum dixit. Igitur, redeunte grata pugna, munere fessoris fungitur Adolescens. Iterum ex conventu Mulier cum anserem postulasset, renuit Adolescens, pari ratione se cum illa esse asserens. Non enim se pretium accepisse, sed repulisse injuriam illatam; nam se prius a Muliere subactum. Cum longior progrederetur contentio, superveniens Vir sciscitatur, quaenam haec sit controversia. Cupiebam, inquit uxor, tibi caenam opipare oarare, nisi hic maledictus impediret: Convenerat enim mecum in viginti solidis: nunc postquam introivit dumum, mutata est sententia, duos amplius requirit. Eia, inquit Vir, tam parva res impedit caenam nostram! Accipe, inquit, quodlibet. Ita Rusticus pretium abstulit et concubitum exoris.

Instead of gold, or some easy substitute for gold, such as valuable clothing, as in other variants, here the object of exchange is a goose; we recall the two fishes of the Arabian variant reported by Rescher. While the farmer does not receive his gift back again, nevertheless he does defeat the bargain, and gains something in addition to the favors of the wife.

Hans Sachs contributes a version for the third time, a fact which should indicate the currency of this type during the sixteenth century. It seems fairly certain that he is imitating Poggio, with more freedom, however, than he used in imitating *Decameron* VIII, 1 and 2. The ruse varies slightly. The owner of the goose pretends to the

---

de Saint-Just, *Espiègleries, Joyeusetés* . . . I, 138, and Nogaret, *Nuits parisiennes,* which I suspect were taken over from the notes to the London, 1798, edition, and may belong here.

Digitized by Google

husband that the agreement with the wife involved only the feathers of the goose, while the wife insists that the whole bird was bargained for.[1]

Not so simple is the relationship of a tale which comes from southern Russia, having been collected from the folk in the last decade of the nineteenth century.[2]

> One market day a countryman wandered into town with a hare over his shoulder. "What will you take for your hare?" asked a baker-woman. "All the bread I can eat," was the reply. The bargain agreed upon, the rustic began to turn up all the baskets in the booth after he had eaten three loaves, to find out, he said, whether there was enough bread there to satisfy him. The baker-woman, angered, drove him out of the booth and threw his hare after him. The same trick was repeated with a wine-seller. The third incident is a *contretemps d'amour,* very similar to the one in Poggio's *Anser venalis* and in the *Jardin parfumé* tale about Bahloul. The countryman finally went his way, having had his fill of bread, wine, and woman, and yet still possessing the hare.

We are reminded to some extent of the rogue in the *Bouchier d'Abbeville* and his sheep-skin; but other versions, between 1450 and 1890, and between France and Russia,

---

[1] *Sämtliche Fabeln und Schwänke von Hans Sachs,* edd. E. Goetze and C. Drescher, Halle a. S., 1913, VI, 27 ff., no. 848, *Der hecker mit der gans* (*Neudrucke,* nos. 231—235), dated 1553. Unquestionably Bernard le Monnoye's *Rusticus capos vendens* (*Pogii . . . facetiarum,* London, 1798, II, 65) and Imbert's *Le marché rompu* (*Nouvelles historiettes en vers,* Amsterdam and Paris, 1781, IV, p. 189, no. 8; not in the ed. of 1774) are direct borrowings from Poggio. In the latter the goose is returned. Also probably under the influence of Poggio is *Von einem Bauren der seine Ganss verkauffte,* in *Der Geist von Jan Tambour,* s. a. et l., p. 122. I do not know whether this tale occurs in the Dutch original of the work (see above, p. 27, note 1). The farmer hangs about the house of the woman until her husband inquires the reason.

[2] *Anthropophyteia* I, 411 ff.

Digitized by Google

are too scanty to justify our postulating any source relationship between the two.

Goldsmiths and their wares play a prominent part in the history of another group of the same general story-type in Germany. The *Factum cuiusdam Francigenae,* first found in Bebel's *Facetiae,* (1505—1507), is an example.[1]

> A certain Frenchman had borrowed a hundred gold pieces from a citizen of Ticino, giving as pledge a gold chain. He went to the citizen's wife and asked her to be his love for the hundred gold pieces. She agreed (for money is the best means of conquering chastity). The next day, his desires satisfied, the Frenchman met the husband and asked to have his chain back, as he had returned the hundred gold pieces to the wife. As she could not deny receiving the money, the chain was returned

It is certainly far from impossible that we have here simply an adaptation of *Decameron,* VIII, 1, with a more plausible situation for the loan of the money by the husband after proper security has been deposited. If this is such an imitation, at any rate it is the earliest of a new group, for we have a short series of tales in which some object of value is deposited with the husband, usually a goldsmith, in return for the loan, which is returned to the wife in the absence of the husband. The *Nugae venales* of

[1] See A. Wesselski's translation of Bebel, München and Leipzig, 1907, Book III, chapter 49, notes, vol II, p. 116; cf. also the introduction, pp. xix, and xx. The work was reprinted frequently during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. I have seen the *Factum cuiusdam Francigenae* in the following editions: 1570, p. 92; 1590, p. 107; 1600, p. 84; 1615, p. 111; 1651, p. 187; 1660, p. 187 (the last three are published with the *Facetiae* of Frischlinus). Cf. C. H. Herford, *Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century,* Cambridge, 1886, p. 242. Karl Amrain, *Deutsche Schwankerzähler des XV. bis XVII. Jahrhunderts* I: *Heinrich Bebels Facetien,* Leipzig, 1907 (*Historische Quellenschriften zum Studium der Anthropophyteia* II) is a selection which omits III, 49.

Digitized by Google

Richard Head supplies us with a slight variant of this situation, where the only change is that the lover deposits a jewel instead of a gold chain.[1]

A "goldsmith" variant, upon the history of which there has been more speculation, is Chapter 76 of Frey's *Gartengesellschaft* (1556), *Von einer goldtschmidin zu Augsburg und einem jungen edelmann, wie sie im ein guldin kettin ab erbulet und wider gab.*[2]

> An innkeeper of Augsburg lived next door to a rich goldsmith and his pretty wife. The wife coveted the innkeeper's gold chain, and the innkeeper admired the wife. An agreement was easily reached. During the goldsmith's absence the wife yielded to the innkeeper's desires in return for the gold chain. Later the innkeeper got the chain back by means of the mortar trick, precisely as in *Decameron* VIII, 2.

In Professor Bolte's notes on this tale, he expresses the opinion that the first part is from *Decameron* VIII, 1, by way of the *Factum cuiusdam Francigenae* of Bebel. Bebel's story may, of course, have such a source, although, with the *motif* clearly in existence before Boccaccio, this is not necessarily the only possible explanation. The conclusion is obviously based on *Decameron* VIII, 2, but the relationship with the *Factum cuiusdam Francigenae* is not so obvious to me. It seems more reasonable to assume that the latter story, with its deception of the wife by

[1] Richard Head, *Nugae venales, or, a Complaisant Companion* . . . The Third Edition Corrected . . . London, 1686, p. 92, no. 219. I have not seen the editions of 1648 or 1681. The security is a cup in *Das schön Goldschmitts Weib,* Meisterlied im kurtzen thon Hans Vogels, gedichtet von Hans Vogel 1539 den 18. april, printed by Bolte in his edition of *Martin Montanus Schwankbücher,* Tübingen, 1899, p. 540. See Bolte's article in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen,* CXXVII (1911–12) pp. 273–301.

[2] Ed. J. Bolte, Tübingen, 1896, pp. 90 ff. Valuable notes, pp. 243 ff.

Digitized by Google

means of the gold chain, is simply a separate development of the Lover's Gift Regained type, not necessarily connected with *Decameron* VIII, 1, and that we have in Frey 76 a readaptation of it from the *Factum cuiusdam Francigenae,* with the mortar trick from *Decameron* VIII, 2, added.[1]

Johannes Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst,* in the edition of 1560 only, (no. 51, fol. 136b) yields a story similar to the *Factum cuiusdam Francigenae,* in *Eins Goldschmids Weib überkompt mit Bulen eine güldne Kette,* which is repeated verbatim in the *Kurtzweilige und Lächerliche Geschicht,* Frankfurt, 1583, p. 191, *Einer Goldtschmidin schenckt einer ein güldine Ketten.*

Yet another group, somewhat vaguely constituted, is represented by the first tale of the Ninth Night of *Le piacevoli notti,* 1550—53, of Straparola, where we find a curious echo of the glass of water and of the horse and wagon groups. The lover coerces the wife into returning his gift by threatening to expose her to her husband.[2]

> Since it has been prophesied to King Galafro of Spain that his wife Feliciana will be unfaithful to him, he locks her up in a tower. However, Galeotto, son of King Diego of Castile, hears of her beauty and determines to win her favor. Disguised as a merchant, he appears at the tower with precious cloth embroidered in gold and silver and gems for sale. The queen becomes curious, and, persuaded by her winning words and the lavish promises of Galeotto, the guards allow him to pass. He makes known his passion to the queen, who looks upon him kindly, but insists on his

[1] For an expression of this opinion, see A. L. Stiefel, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte,* N. F. vol. XII (1898), pp. 164—185, who rejects *Dec.* VIII, 1 and the *Factum cuiusdam Francigenae,* and offers „irgend eine unbekannte Quelle", in view of the wide dissemination of the type. I have been unable to see *Antihypochondriakus,* Erfurt, 1782, vol. I, p. 38, no. 64, to which Stiefel (p. 172) refers.

[2] Straparola, *Le piacevoli notti,* ed. G. Rua, Bologna, 1899—1908, II, Notte IX, Fav. 1, pp. 122 ff.

Digitized by Google

giving her his wares as the price of her compliance. The bargain consummated, he then demands the return of his wares, otherwise threatening to stay until the king returns, whereupon the queen restores the cloth. The guards demand the money which Galeotto promised them, but he refuses to pay them, and they dare not keep him for fear the king will discover that they have permitted him to enter. The king, returning, hears the merchant shouting, "I know well enough all about it, but I have no mind to tell." Amused, the king repeats this as he greets the queen, who, terrified, confesses the whole story. The king resigns himself to the will of heaven, razes the tower, and lives happily ever after with his wife.

We find the same tale, with the environment much altered, almost a century earlier (1462) in France, written (possibly) by Antoine de la Sale. The element of coercion, it will be noticed, is identical with that in the Straparola variant.[1]

A gentleman of Burgundy is attracted to a chambermaid in a Paris hotel where he is staying. He sends his servant to negotiate with her; he learns that the rate is "dix escus". The gentleman feels that this is rather exorbitant, but finally pays it. Once in the girl's room with the bargain consum-

[1] *Les cent nouvelles nouvelles,* ed. P. L. Jacob, Paris, 1858, no. 18, pp. 95 ff. Cf. W. Küchler, *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur,* XXX (1906) 264. Parallel with this last in that coercion is employed to regain the money is the story of the bellicose Frenchman who overcomes the avaricious husband by a display of weapons while he is visiting the wife, in Richard Head's *Nugae venales, or Choice Novels,* London, 1686, p. 268. Perhaps here if anywhere belongs the filthy tale of Nicolas de Troyes, no. 46 of the *Grand parangon des nouvelles nouvelles,* ed. E. Mabille, Paris, 1869, pp. 200 ff., *Du'n marchant qui bailla cent escus a son hostesse pour coucher avec elle, puis apres s'en repentit et comment il disoit qu'il s'en tenoit a la souppe et ne vouloit de sa char pour le prix.* The 29th of Malespini's *Ducento Novelle* (Venice, 1609, pp. 81 ff.) is certainly not copied from *Cent nouvelles nouvelles* 18, as Lee, *Decameron,* p. 247 asserts. In Malespini the stupid maidservant's husband is dead, and no lover's gift is regained.

Digitized by Google

mated, he repents his money, and finally compels the girl to pay it back to him, on pain of being discovered to her employer. At the last he betrays her while she is carrying him past the host's room in the early morning hours.

Küchler would have it that a relationship of some sort exists between this tale and the *fabliau Du prestre et de la dame* on the one hand, and *Decameron* VIII, 1 and 2 on the other. *Decameron* VIII, 2, he thinks, preserves "die natürliche, primitive Form" of the tale, while the author of the *fabliau* had only vaguely in mind that kind of tale, and out of his feeble recollection produced *Du prestre et de la dame.* We cannot agree entirely with Küchler, for we have now seen enough variants of the Lover's Gift Regained type to be certain that in neither of Boccaccio's tales do we possess a "natural, primitive form" of the type. A brief consideration of the story of the *fabliau* will be sufficient to indicate, at any rate, that the *Decameron* tale is not its source.[1]

A wife has an *amour* with the village priest. One day while her husband is away she sends for the priest, who brings a pasty for a grand feast. No sooner have they sat down to it than the husband unexpectedly returns. The wife hides evidence of the feast, conceals the priest under a large basket, and opens the door for the husband, who immediately goes upstairs. The priest has ample opportunity to escape, but his cloak is in the room, and he does not want

[1] *Du prestre et de la dame,* Montaiglon and Raynaud, II, 235 ff. W. Küchler, *Die Cent nouvelles nouvelles, Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur,* XXX (1906) 277—78. Cf. Dunlop-Wilson, *History of Prose Fiction,* London, 1896, II, 123 ff. (Bohn's Library). For hidden monk, see *Les contes et discours d'Eutrapel,* ed. C. Hippeau, Paris, 1875, I, 161 ff., chapter 12 (Cf. R. Förster, *Die sogenannten facetiösen Werke Noëls du Faill,* Halle, 1912, p. 42); C. R. Baskervill, *The Elizabethan Jig,* Chicago, 1929, pp. 245 ff.; *La bourgeoise d'Orléans* (Bédier, *Les fabliaux*[4], p. 449. The story of Philesitherus (Apuleius, *Golden Ass,* IX) is related to that of the *fabliau.*

Digitized by Google

to lose the pasty. As the husband comes downstairs, the priest says to the wife, "Neighbor, I have just returned your basket, and should like to have back my coat, which I left as a pledge. I should also like to have the pasty which I left with you this morning." The husband scolds the wife for having required a pledge of the priest, and insists that she give back the things. The wife gives him his cloak, but refuses to give him the pasty unless he will stay and eat it with them. The rest of the story does not concern us here.

It is probable, as Küchler intimates, that there is a common source behind these two tales. It will be observed, however, that if *Decameron* VIII, 2 is a late and artificial version, relatively far removed from the older and simpler versions of the type, then this *fabliau* is even farther removed. The whole emphasis of the type in general has been shifted in the *fabliau.* We have no lover's gift whatever, and no bargain. At first we see the priest and the wife in easy, amicable relationship, on a basis of perfect agreement and understanding, with no stipulation concerning a reward for services rendered. In fact, a gift is not mentioned until the priest, caught in an awkward situation, and knowing that he can depend upon the wife, hits upon a happy scheme for solving the difficulty. It is worth noting that the climax here is the husband's return. His return is essential to the plot. In Boccaccio, and in other variants, the precise moment of his return is of indifferent importance. Küchler perceives the lack of verisimilitude in the prompt co-öperation of the priest and the wife in the emergency, and rightly infers from it that this is not a primitive version; but he does not note that the elaboration is in all probability due to the author of the *fabliau,* and not to a popular alteration in the type. *Du prestre et de la dame,* then, must be regarded as another of the numerous literary adaptations of the type, worked up by a writer of no mean skill.

Feminine love of finery plays a prominent part in lending motivation to this type of story. Money given

Digitized by Google

with which to purchase adornment, clothing itself, jewelry, all have been used as gifts by the lover. In another small group an easy step is taken, cloth with which to make a garment replacing the garment itself. The earliest of this group, the first of Giraldo Giraldi's *Novelle* (1477—79), may again be an adaptation of *Decameron* VIII, 1, although there is a possibility that the tale reached Giraldi through some other source. It is essentially the same as *Decameron* VIII, 1, save that a piece of cloth is the gift. The lover is a priest, and the wife is avaricious.[1]

The version of Charles Bourdigné, written in Angers about 1532, is quite certainly uninfluenced by Giraldi's, although the evidence cited by Livingston (see below), to the effect that the *Novelle* of Giraldi were not printed until 1796, is not necessary to prove it. *Comment de rechef fut amoureux de quelque dame, à qui, pour ce faire, donna trois aulnes d'escarlatte* is a tale told of that Pantagruelian rogue, Pierre Faifeu, who borrows the cloth from a draper, and tells the girl that the color will be improved if the material is exposed to the night air. She hangs it out her window, whence the lover steals it and returns it to the merchant.[2] This does not seem to be derived from either of the *Decameron* tales. The rogue Faifeu, like Eulenspiegel or Friar Rush, naturally attracted to himself a large number of unattached tales from popular tradition. It is clearly evident that the Lover's Gift Regained type was a part of popular as well as of literary tradition during the Renaissance.

---

[1] *Le novelle di Giraldo Giraldi,* ed. D. G. Cioni, Amsterdam, 1796, pp. 6 ff.

[2] *La légende ioyeuse de Maistre Pierre Faifeu,* ed. Jacob, Paris, 1880, pp. 97 ff., chapter 31. On cloth-cheating, cf. Herford, *Literary Relations . . .,* p. 81, and Bédier, *Les Fabliaux*[4], pp. 443 ff. *(Auberée).*

Digitized by Google

The *Grand parangon des nouvelles nouvelles,* compiled by Nicholas de Troyes in Champagne about 1536, contains a story which falls in this group. [1]

> *D'un Gentilhomme qui donna pour cinquante Escus de Velours à une Barbiere pour faire son plaisir d'elle et comme son Serviteur trouva Façon de le ravoir.* The ruse is as follows: the servant takes a coin and offers it to the wife in the presence of the barber, pretending that since his master did not have money with which to pay for the wife's work, she insisted on his leaving the velvet as security for payment. The husband orders her to return the cloth.

Livingston regards the story as a free imitation of *Decameron* VIII, 2, properly rejecting the possibility of influence from Giraldo Giraldi, which has little to do with this variant. I should be inclined to go a step farther, and reject the influence of Boccaccio. The relationship between this and the Pierre Faifeu story seems quite plain. If the situation is examined from Livingston's point of view, the only variants known being those of the *Decameron,* of Faifeu, and of the *Grand parangon,* it would seem necessary to postulate the *Decameron* as source; but with our perspective of many other variants of the type there is no longer any such necessity, and we perceive that a clear line of descent for this piece-of-cloth type can be made out without recourse to Boccaccio.

The last group which I shall discuss is of particular interest because of the large number of variants, all of which were collected from the folk in the vicinity of the

[1] C. H. Livingston, *Modern Philology* XXII (1924) 40—42. Cf. the same author's article in *Revue du Seizième Siècle* X (1923) 1 ff. The seventy-first of the *Cent nouvelles nouvelles* of Philippe de Vigneulles, written between 1505 and 1515, printed here by Livingston, pp. 37—38, is probably, as he assumes, a very free imitation of *Dec.* VIII, 2; but it seems likely that VIII, 1 is also involved. The gift is a *sèriz,* an instrument for carding flax, which reminds of the two *sèr* of gold in the Marathi-*Çukasaptati* no. 70.



Digitized by Google

Baltic Sea within the last sixty years. One, no. 49, was collected in 1927, and this final group is therefore the only one of the type which can be said to be current among the folk at the present time. The story which concerns us is combined in this group, for the first time, with several others; thus we have before us an example of a very common occurrence in the life-history of a popular tale. It may have an independent existence as a story-type, and at the same time become merged as a *motif* with other tales in such a way as to form a distinct type. In addition to constituting a type, then, the Lover's Gift Regained appears also as a *motif* in common with several other tales. This type has been recognized in *The Types of the Folk-tale* (FF Comm. 74) as no. 1731, *The Youth and the Pretty Shoes*. From the fifty-one variants which I have been able to examine, I infer that the part of the tale which concerns us runs as follows:

> While the parson is away, a youth appears at a parsonage carrying a pair of women's shoes. He first meets the maid, who asks the price of the shoes. The youth replies that he will not accept money for them, as he desires only the favors of the maid. She agrees reluctantly to his demands, but after the conclusion of the bargain the youth threatens to inform the parson of the terms of the bargain. In order to buy his silence, the maid returns the shoes and gives him money besides. The episode is repeated twice, once with the parson's daughter and once with the parson's wife. The youth leaves the parsonage still in possession of the shoes, and much richer than when he came.

The history of type 1731 in the Baltic region presents many a pretty problem for one interested in the subject of tale transmission, but unfortunately the other four or five *motifs* which combine to constitute the type are of such a nature that the language necessary for discussing them could not by the broadest definition of the word be called polite. It must suffice here to say that the development is

Digitized by Google

by means of very elaborate scatologial details. For convenience, I shall list the fifty-one variants in my possession. Nos. 1—42 are from Finland, and are identified by the numbers according to which they are filed in the folklore collection in Helsingfors; no. 43 is available as noted; nos. 44—49 are from Esthonia, and are identified by the numbers according to which they are filed in the folklore collection in Dorpat; and nos. 50 and 51 are from the E. T. Kristensen manuscript collections in the Dansk Folkemindesamling, Copenhagen.[1]

Finland:

1. 1731 a 2.
2. 1731 b 3.
3. 1731 b 4.
4. 1731 b 6.
5. 1731 b 7.
6. 1731 b 10.
7. 1731 b 10.
8. 1731 b 11.
9. 1731 b 12.
10. 1731 b 13.
11. 1731 b 14.
12. 1731 b 15.
13. 1731 b 20.
14. 1731 b 21.
15. 1731 b 23.
16. 1731 b 24.
17. 1731 d 29.
18. 1731 d 30.
19. 1731 d 31.
20. 1731 b 8.
21. 1731 b 18.
22. 1731 j 47.
23. 1731 j 50.
24. 1731 j 52.
25. 1731 j 54.
26. 1731 k 57.
27. 1731 k 60.
28. 1731 l 65.
29. 1731 a 71.
30. 1731 b 19.
31. 1731 b 25.
32. 1731 g 25.
33. 1731 j 45.
34. 1731 j 47.
35. 1731 j 74.
36. 1731 j 75.

[1] These variants were assembled through the aid furnished by FF COMM. 5, 6, 25, 33, and 46, Type 1731. The version of 1731 which is to be found in A. N. Afanasiev, *Narodnia russkia skazky,* Moscow, 1861 (cf. FF COMM. 10, page 10) does not include the *motif* here concerned. To the complaisance of Professor dr. Kaarle Krohn (Helsingfors), Professor dr. Walter Anderson (Dorpat), and Arkivar Hans Ellekilde (Copenhagen) I owe the possession of these variants. Arkivar dr. O. Loorits of the National Museum of Folklore in Dorpat writes me (Dec. 23, 1929) that he suspects that there are many more variants in the as yet uncatalogued collections under his control; and the same no doubt holds good for other collections in the north.

Digitized by Google

37. 1731 j 76. 39. 1731 e 33. 41. 1731 l 64.
38. 1731 e 32. 40. 1731 l 63. 42. 1731 i 41.

43. From Svenska Litteratursällskap's mss. in Helsingfors, printed in *Finlands svenska folkdiktning,* vol. II, ed. Oskar Hackman. Helsingfors, 1920, no. 306, 2 (Skrifter utgivna av svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, CLI).

Esthonia:

44. H II 10, 615 41. Collected in 1889.
45. H II 54, 57 62(3). „ „ 1895.
46. H III 17, 841 3(19). „ „ 1894.
47. H II 46, 183 5(17). „ „ 1892.
48. H II 46, 185 8(18). „ „ 1893.
49. E 60157 61. „ „ 1927.

Denmark:

50. E. T. Kristensen 654.
51. „ „ „ 1882.

With but four exceptions, the gift is a pair of pretty shoes. In no. 32 it is a gold watch, in nos. 34 and 35 it is a grouse, and in no. 48 it is a cow. This group, again, does not articulate clearly with the others; the history of the tale must remain relatively incomplete until variants are discovered which show the relationships among the separate groups. Yet here and there we come upon details which remind us strongly of earlier stories. The youth is a rogue of much the same type as the butcher of Abbeville, and both rogues ply their trade successfully in the establishment of a parson. In the Straparola version (p. 44, above) the king-husband unintentionally forces a confession by remarking upon his return, "I know well enough all about it, but I have no mind to tell." No less than twenty-four of the variants of this group [1] depict a similar scene. After

[1] Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 43, 47, 48.

Digitized by Google

he has left the parsonage, the youth meets the parson on the road and prescribes a remedy for his bald (scabby) head. Part of the remedy is a charm which the parson must recite as he enters the house: "I know what I know, but I won't tell." A confession follows, just as in the Straparola tale. In every one of the fifty-one variants, the youth regains the gift by coercion: he threatens to expose the women to the parson. In no. 10 the youth uses the same trick as the one in the versions of Poggio's *Anser venalis,* etc. (p. 41, above). Yet these reminiscences, while probably not fortuitous, are insufficient to display clearly which group or which tale is the prototype of *The Youth with the Pretty Shoes.* The Baltic Sea group, then, merely adds force to our earlier impression that the Lover's Gift Regained type is very widely disseminated; and, since there is no evidence in any of these versions of influence from Boccaccio, we have some indication that even a collection of the enormous importance of the *Decameron* does not necessarily destroy the independent life of analogous tales among the folk.

Our examination of the all-too-few variants of the Lover's Gift Regained type shows that they fall into several more or less distinct groups the inter-relationship of which must await explanation until many more variants can be included. In the first place, as I see the gradual development of the type, we have simply a lover's gift got back from the mistress by one ruse or another. In the more primitive versions, which I have called the central group (*Çukasaptati* 34, the glass of water group, the first part of *Decameron* VIII, 2) this is all there is to the plot. The husband—where there is a husband—does not enter the story until nearly the end, when he enters merely to return the gift to the lover. The earlier forms seem to indicate that the gift might be any article of value which the lover might have or which the mistress might desire. Later,

Digitized by Google

money becomes substituted for the miscellaneous love-gift. Here is the germ of the later stories of avarice on the part of the wife, *Decameron* VIII, 1 showing the type; and here, too, enters the element of prostitution, as seen in no. 31 of the *Grand parangon des nouvelles nouvelles* and in Kaufringer's German prose tale. Lovers are frequently out of money, and almost as frequently borrow it to meet the emergency. Then, some tale-teller conceived the idea of making the situation more complicated and more humorous by making the husband the innocent instrument of his own cuckoldom. The absence of such variants does not refute a conjecture that just such a tale would be typical of the medieval *fabliau* and of the Oriental tales of discomfited husbands. The husband is brought into the story at the beginning so that the lover may borrow from him the money with which he expects to corrupt the wife.[1]

Chaucer's *Shipman's Tale* stands toward the beginning in this line of development, Sercambi's *Novella,* the *Bouchier d'Abbeville,* and quite certainly *Du prestre et de la dame* toward the end; yet all four are fairly close in date.

---

[1] In view of the establishment of this type, I propose the following entry in the next edition of Aarne-Thompson, *Types of the Folk-tale (FF Communications 74):*

1420. *The Lover's Gift Regained.*

A. *The Broken (Removed) Article.*
The lover breaks (or removes) an article of household equipment, and convinces the husband that for that reason the wife has confiscated that which he gave her as a present.
** Spargo, FF COMM. 91; cf. 1420 B.

B. *Horse and Wagon as Gift.*
The lover regains gift of horse and wagon by pretending to the husband that the wife has confiscated them because he brought wood of uneven quality.
** Erk-Böhme, *Deutscher Liederhort,* Leipzig, 1893—94, I, 40 ff.; ** Spargo, FF COMM. 91.

Digitized by Google

Chaucer's original probably had the money element introduced. We can be certain that it concerned a merchant and a monk, as several of the extant versions do so. Whether the conclusion was as merry in his original as in Chaucer we cannot be sure. All that we can be sure of is that what viciousness there was in the original, if any, Chaucer deleted. Probably there was none, as it would seem that Chaucer's chief contribution to the story is its consummate development of characterization. We have here exemplified a perfect illustration of what happens to a tale in transmission. On the one line of descent we find the Italian *novella* packed with lust and treachery and ending in sudden death; on another we find Chaucer's tale, with the same essentials of plot, striking a note of relative innocence and turning what are essentially sordid elements into a short story of bright spring sunlight through his gift of superb characterization; and on yet another line, we see an Oriental apologue on the faithlessness of women becoming in Germany a means of confirming the faith of the people in the suffering Christ.

---

C. *Borrowing from the Husband and Returning to the Wife.*

The lover borrows money from the husband with which to corrupt the wife, later telling the husband that the money was returned to the wife during the husband's absence.

** Lee, *Decameron,* 247 ff.; ** Spargo, FF COMM. 91; Chaucer's *Shipman's Tale.*

D. *Accidental Discovery of Identity.*

The lover, ignorant of the identity of the husband, tells him of his experience with the wife. The husband persuades the lover to lead him to the scene, where the wife is compelled to restore all but a small part of the money.

** Euling, *Studien über Heinrich Kaufringer,* Breslau, 1900, 65 ff.; ** Spargo, FF COMM. 91.

Digitized by Google

Speculation concerning the nature of Chaucer's immediate source should take into consideration one factor which it is easy for Chaucerians to forget. That is the high standard of literary craftsmanship which prevailed during and prior to the end of the fourteenth century. Several of the *fabliaux* which have been mentioned in the course of this study are instances of this artistry, and others occur throughout the pages of the edition of Montaiglon and Raynaud. Altogether remarkable for its beauty of language, for its high spirits, and its consciousness of the wine of life, is *Daz redelîn,* in the *Gesammtabenteuer* of von der Hagen (III, 105 ff.); and still more apposite is *Irregang und Girregar,* in the same collection (III, 37 ff.), which displays all of the animation, the swift change of scene, and the amazingly realistic portrayal of the fight in the darkened room, in the almost identical episode in Chaucer's *Reeve's Tale.* There is no *a priori* reason why the *Shipman's Tale* should not have been taken over almost *verbatim* from an Old French *fabliau.*

---

E. *Piece of Cloth as Gift.*
The lover regains by a ruse and thievery the borrowed piece of cloth which he has presented to his mistress. ** Spargo, FF COMM. 91.

F. *Jewelry as Gift.*
The lover presents the wife with a valuable piece of jewelry, which he regains by pretending to the husband that he has left it as a pledge.
** Wesselski's *Bebel,* München, 1907, III, cap. 49;
** Bolte's ed. of Frey's *Gartengesellschaft,* Tübingen, 1896, no. 76; ** Spargo, FF COMM. 91.

G. *Anser venalis. (Goose as Gift).*
The lover regains his gift by a ruse (obscene).
** Semerau, *Die Schwänke und Schnurren des Poggio,* Leipzig, 1905, no. 69; ** Spargo, FF COMM. 91.

Digitized by Google

# A FEW OF THE RARER ANALOGUES

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Lieblicher Sommer-Klee und Anmuthiges Winter-Grün. s. l., 1670.

p. 183, no. 333.

Ein Bawer brachte ein Fuder Holtz zu Hofe | der Juncker war auff die Jagt | die Fraw sahe oben zum Fenster auss | der Bawer souffzete | und sprach bey jhm: O möchte ich nur einmahl | ich wollte meine beyde Pferde drumb geben. Die Fraw merckte sein Anligen | liess ihn auffodern | und erfüllete seinen Willen. Nach geschehener Tat | sprach er: Ach | ach meine beyde Pferde | es ist doch eins als das ander | (meynte dass dess Edelmans Frawen jhr | besser als seiner Frawen seyn solte). Wie diser also weheklagend die Treppe herunter gehet | begegnet jhm der Junker; fraget derowegen seine Fraw | was sie dem Bawer gethan (Sie gab zur Antwort: Der Schelm hat Holtz gebracht | und saget | ein Stück sey so gut und so gross als das ander | darumb habe ich jhm seine zwey Pferde nemmen lassen. Der Juncker sprach: Ey | lasset den armen Kerl doch fahren | da fuhr er.

---

De Geest van Jan Tamboer. I—II Deel, Amsterdam, 1664.

p. 153: "Herdige Klucht van een Barbier, en een Apotheeckers Vrouwe."

Zeker Barbier, dickwils komende tot een Apteker, om sijn Waren to koopen, kreeg ondertusschen lust om by des Apotheeckers Vrouwe te slepen, (de welke seer schoon was) en was haer dickwils aen om by haer te slapen, maer en koude niet wel tot sijn voornemen komen, so gebeurde het eens op een tijt, dat de Apteecker von huys was, quam weder en hielt hart aen, om by haer te slapen, maer sy wilde dat niet toestaen: Doch eyndelijck door groote giften van eenige stucken gouls, die hy haer gaf, dat sy uyt gierrgheyt nennan, en dede doen sijn werck met haer: dat gedaen hebbende, teende hy haer de Vijsel af. De Man weder te huys komende, hed welck den Barbier gehoord hadde, bracht doe de Vijsel wederom, en seyde tegen de Man, daet so

Digitized by Google

wel en langht my nu det Geldt weder, det ick u Vrouwe te pande gelaten hebbe: De Man dat vreemt voor-komende, seyde, Vrouwe, hebt ghy de Meester pandt afgenommen? Wat is dat gedaen? Een Man, daer wy dagelijks soo veel geldt van ontfangen, ick will hem wel voor hondert gulden borgen, ick swijge van een Vijsel te leeuen. De Vrouw quaet, en half beschaemt wardende, seyde, ick en woudese hem niet doen sonder pandt, heeft hy de Vijsel al weder gebracht? js, seide de Man. Wel, daer is dan sijn pandt weer, maer ick sweer hem, hy sal sijn leven niet weer in mijn Vijsel stooten, hy sal seecker al, seyde de Man, hy sal niet, seyde hie; hy niet wetende wat Vijsel dat sy meende.

---

Lyrum Larum Lyrissimum. s. l., 1700.
no. 162, p. 81.

Ein Franzos kam nacher Papho in Welschland | daselbst wurd er gegen einen schöne Wirthin entzündet | welcher zu geniessen | er solche List erdachte: Er versetzte dem Wirth eine guldene Ketten vor hundert Ducaten | die hundert Ducaten bot er der Wirthin: wenn sie ihm wolte zu Willen seyn: Die Wirthin läszt ihr das Hertz mit den rothen Füchsen Fuchsweisz bestechen | und liess sich vom Franzosen brauchen. Der Franzos gieng nach verrichteten Werck | zum Wirth | begehrte seine Ketten | denn er habe die hundert Ducaten der Frauen wieder gegeben. Die gute Frau kunts nich laugnen | durffte aber nicht sagen | was sie ihm dargegen gegeben hätte | muste also dem Franzosen umsonst gedienet haben.

---

Der Geist von Jan Tambour . . . aus dem Holländischen ins Teutsche übersetzt. S. d. et l.
p. 221: Von einem Bauren der seine Ganss verkauffte.

Ob wol ein Baur etliche Gänse zu kauf brachte | so kam eine Frauens-Person und fragte was er für die Ganss haben wollte. Der Bauer sprach. ich wil sie nicht verkauffen | sondern verbuhlen | da sagte sie die wil ich wol verdienen | vereinigten sich also mit einander | und giengen zusammen in eine Herberge | und vollbrachten ihrer Liebe Lüste. Wie es geschehen | bedanckten sie sich gegen einander | und die Fraue „gieng mit der Ganss zur Hause. Der Bauer war ein loser Schalk | gieng ohngefehr umb 1 Uhr vor der Frauen Hauss stehen | welches der Mann sahe | und fragte die Frau was er wolte | sie gedachte wol was er begehrte |

Digitized by Google

lieff aus verstörten Sinn zu ihm | und fragte was er begehrte. Der Bauer antwortet | ich will das Geld vor die Ganss haben | sie dorftte nicht viel sagen | gab ihm das Geld | und der Bauer gieng wieder seine Strasse. Wie sie nun wieder ind Hauss kam | fragte der Mann was der Bauer gewolt hatte | sie sprach das Geld vor die Ganss | warumb last ihr den ungeschickten Bauren so lange stehen | sprach der Mann | sie antwortet: Er ist so schlecht nicht | er weiss seine Ganss wol zu verkauffen.

---

R. Head. *Nugae venales.* London, 1786.
Choice Novels.
p. 268.

A *French-man* not long since took a Lodging near a Baker, who though Poor, yet very Rich in having so hansome a Woman to his Wife, and was never blemisht in her Reputation by any light deportment. The *French-man* presently had her in his Eye, and courted her importunately, and expensively, but to no purpose; Treats *(sic ?)* proving ineffectual, he offer'd her Fifty *Guinney's* if she would permit him to lie with her all night; she refused it; but privately told her Husband what Monsieur had offered her, and upon what account; the Baker scratcht his Head not knowing what to do; Poverty persuaded on the one side, and love hindred on the other from accepting this proffer; at length said he, *Dearest,* there is a way to be thought on to save thy Chastity and yet we will have his Money, and that is thus: I will pretend to go out of Town such a day, then do you upon the condition aioresaid promise Monsieur his satisfaction the night following, in the mean time, you know Tom — — — the Cobler, a stout Fellow, him will I engage with Five Pounds to assist me, we will have each of us a good broad Sword, and thus Armed we will creep underneath your Bed, and when the *French*-man hath paid you the Gold (which you must have first) and he is just going to Bed we will crawl out and surprize him. It was generally agreed, and Monsieur had notice of the assignation, who though he understood that the Husband was gone out of Town, yet he feared an Ambuscado; and therefore carried a brace of Pistols with him, besides a good Rapier. Entring the Room, he Caressed her, *A-la-made (sic) de France,* and being very fiery, he could suffer no delays, but giving her the Gold, ordered her to make what hast she could to Bed, and he would follow after. In the first place he drew out his Pistols and laid them by him, and

Digitized by Google

then undrest himself; seeing her in Bed, he takes up his Sword, and Pistols and advanceth towards her; she seeing him in that posture, ask'd him what he meant? *Noting Madam of harm, only me love to have all de Arms, me sord by mee side, me Pistools in me haunds, and de Dagger before, when me go to take a Cittadel or Fort,* and laying down his Sword, by his Bed side, he skipt into Bed with his Pistols and laid them just over her head; not to lose time, he Storm'd the Fort, and took it, and notwithstanding he was several times beaten out of the breach was made in the assault, yet he boldly entred again and took possession. The poor Cuckold (and the Cobler who lay underneath the Bed) could not but hear what was doing above, yet durst not so much as whisper, for fear of being heard; Monsieur having gone through stitch with his work, and tired to Boot, leapt out of Bed with his Pistols, and taking up his Sword, went to the farther end of the Room, and drest himself, having so done, he calls to his *reaking Miss,* bidding her to come to him, she excused her self, saying, she was in a great sweat, and might catch her death thereby, but seeing Monsieur grow resolute, she obeyed. Monsieur hereupon clapt a Pistol to her Breast, saying *Begar Mrs. Bish-Fox, give me my Gold, begar if you will not — for love, begar you shall never have my Money,* and so taking the *Guinney's* from her, went couragiously down the stairs to his Lodging.

(The resolution of the tale is mutual recriminations.)

---

R. Head. *Nugae venales.* London, 1686.
p. 92, no. 219.

A gentleman not long since coming by a Goldsmith's shop, saw therein a delicate lovely Woman, whom (as she was) he supposed to be the Mistress of the House, and that he might delight his Eyes, with a less suspected freedom, he went into the shop, and desired to see some Jewels, Rings, Lockets, & c. but having satisfied his phancy for the present by inspecting that charming—heart—inflaming countenance, he bought only a trifle, and went his way, but with a resolution to return. Several times he came to the shop after this manner, so that at length he became indifferently acquainted with the Man and his Wife. Having thus got their acquaintance, he one day came to the Good Man, and shewing him a very rich Jewel, he desired the loan of fifty pound thereon for a Month, it was granted him; in some little time after, he watch'd his opportunity when the old Gentleman

Digitized by Google

was abroad, and went to the House, where he spared neither for cost nor courtship to win this Gentlewoman to compliance to his desires, having well warm'd her with Wine he attempted the violation of her Chastity, by all the subtle stratagems and wiles a young *Italian* can invent in the prosecution of his first Amours; but seeing none of these would take, he offer'd her the fifty pound he had receiv'd of her Husband, saying, that he would freely give it her for one single Amorous encounter; which proffer, like *Jove's* Golden shower on *Danae,* wrought its desired effect. Having consummated what he so passionately desired, in cold blood he began to consider what a rash act he had done; the Gentlewoman on the other side, having got so rich a Booty, with a deal of pleasure to boot, fearing least this serious consultation with himself might produce some mischief, she hastened him to be gone, fearing least her Husband should come, who might by seeing him there, justly suspect some foul play in his absence. No, no, said the Gentleman, (having studied a cunning Plot) let him come, I have bethought myself of a way that shall prevent all suspicion in him, he had no sooner said the words, but the Husband came up the stairs; at his approach this Gentleman stept to him, saying, Sir, I thank you for your late kindness in lending me that fifty pound; I have received Moneys sooner than I expected it, wherefore I have brought it you, and paid it to your Wife; therefore, Sir, pray let me have my Jewel: the Goldsmith ask'd his Wife if it were so; she seeing it was but a folly to deny it (she having then the Money about her) said she had received such a summ of the Gentleman; hereupon the Jewel was delivered, but who by the loan and use of the Money was the gainer, I will leave it to anyone to judge.

---

Les ioyeuses aduentures et plaisant facetieux deuiz fort recreatif, pour resiouyr tous espritz melancolicques.

*A Lyon 1555.*

(fo. D7a) D'un escolier qui donne sa robbe à une ieune Apothicaresse d'Orleans, pour iouyr de son amytié, et comment il eust sa robbe.

Aduenture XX.

Peu au parauant ce compte, aduint à Orleans que un ieune Escolier s'amoura d'une belle et brune Apothicaresse de la ville, laquelle plusieurs fois il solicita de luy faire iouyr, du fruit de

Digitized by Google

son amytié, a quoy la Dame resistoit fermement, et nonobstant
*D7b* plusieurs promesses qui luy faisoit, elle ne voulut condescendre. Un iour aduint le dit mignon s'adressa a elle, et instamment la requeroit, luy donnant a entendre qu'il estoit mort, s'elle n'en auoit pitié: et comme la dame defendoit et remetoit le pauvre trancy en autres propos, il entendit les plainctes qu'elle faisoit contre son mary, qui ne luy vouloit faire livrer du drap pour luy faire une robbe. Adonc dict-il, ma dame, ie suis en la plus extreme peine, ou iamais ie pourrais estre si de moy n'auez pitié, pour ce ie vous donneray ma robbe pour vous faire la robbe que vous demandez, et maintenant que l'occasion est preste, faictes moy iouyr du poinct tant desiré. Alors la dame auaricieuxe s'y accorda, et premier enferma la robe du mignon en son coffre, puis endura lamoureuse accollee: et quand l'escollier eut faict il s'en va en chausses et pourpoint et passa par la bouticque ou il print ung petit mortier et pillon qu'il trouva sur le comptoir, et à trois saultz et un pas il fut en son hostel qui estoit pres d'illec. Quand il fut un peu refroidi, considerant qu'il estoit sans robbe, il s'auisa d'attendre que le mary de la bonne femme fust de retour auquel il deuoit demander sa robbe, et quand il apperceut ledict mary,
*D8a* et en labsence de la dame il rapporta ledict mortier, pillon, et les presenta au mary, luy disant que sa femme luy auoit presté son mortier, à laquelle il auoit delaissé sa robbe en gaige, qu'elle auoit enfermee à un bel coffre de sa chambre. Adonc le mary qui auoit une pareille clef du coffre, feit ouuerture d'icelluy, et sans contredict luy rend sa robbe. Ainsi fut la dame destituee de sa proye, et l'escolier resuestu de sa robbe sans infamie de l'une ou autre des parties.

---

Johannes Pauli, Schimpff und Ernst . . . s. l. 1560.
(Cf. J. Bolte's ed. of Pauli, II, 188.)

fo. 136 b.

Es ist kürtzlicher geschehen mit eines Goldtschmides Weib | wie ich mir lass sagen | die was schön | das sie ein frembder sehre lieb gewan. Der frembde kam liess sie ansprechen | das sie jhm wolte zu gefallen sein | aber es halff kein flehen noch bitten | sie wolt nicht. Noch wolt dieser gleich wol auch nicht nachlassen | kompt selber zu der Frawen | nimpt seine Guldene Ketten | die gross und schwer | henckt sie der Frawen an den Halss | vnd spricht | Die sol ewer sein | wo jhr meinen willen thun wolt. Die Kette gefiel der Frawen; vnd sprach | Ja mein lieber Herr |

Digitized by Google

diese zeit kommet | so wird mein Mann nicht da sein | als dann will ich nach ewerm gefallen. Der frembde kaum wartet darauff | vnd wurde gewert. Da er aber sein lust gnug gebusset hat | gedacht er | herr du must die Ketten wider heben | kompt deshalben zu dem Goldschmid für den Laden | eben wie die Fraw zugegen | vnd spricht | Meister ist mein Ketten widerumb zugerichtet | die ich euch vor drey tagen bracht heb. Der Meister wuste nichts drumb | der Frawen ward bang | die sagt | Ey lieber Herr sie ligt dort | ich hab es warlich vergessen | das ichs meinem Mann nicht geben habe | aber er soll sie bald machen | also must die Fraw die Ketten faren lassen | vnd danckt Gott das er nicht anders sagte.

---

Alexander Smith, Lives of Highwaymen. vol. II, p. 75, London, 1714.

Nicholas Wells, a Murderer and Foot-Pad.

Being by his Folly reduc'd to great Necessities, and much in Debt, he, for a Livelihood, drove a Woodmonger's Cart in *Southwark,* and one Day carrying three Loads of Faggots to a Gentleman's House at Lambeth, as he was making Water not far from the Door, where the Gentleman's Wife stood, her extraordinary Beauty had such an Influence on his Carnal Mind, that he was over-heard by the Gentlewoman to say to himself these Words, *Was I to lie with that handsome Creature, I vow and swear I'd give her my Cart and Horses.* The Gentlewoman, who was none of the chastest, calling him into her Parlour, she wanted to know what 'twas he said, as he was making Water, or otherwise, if he would not tell her, she would call her Footman to kick him well. Our new Carman was somewhat bashful to declare what he had said, but fearing to be ill us'd in case he did not satisfy the Gentlewoman's Demands, he very bluntly told her the Words above-mentioned. The Lady now taking him at his Word, she carry'd him to her Bed-Chamber, where obtaining the Pleasure, for which he had forfeited his Cart and Horses, and finding no Difference betwixt her and his Wife, in that sort of sport, he swore, They were all alike. In this tone he hanker'd about the Street Door a great while, for home to his Master he durst not go, without the Cart and Horses; but at last the Gentlewoman's Husband coming home to Dinner, and seeing the Fellow swearing, *They were all alike, by G—d;* quoth he, *What are all alike?* The Faggots, reply'd the Carman. Quoth the Gentleman again,



Digitized by Google

*And what of that?* To which *Nick* thus answer'd, An't may it please you, Sir, *I have brought home the three Loads of Faggots which you bought, and your Lady being not satisfied that the last Faggots are so big as the first, she hath order'd her Servants to lock up my Cart and Horses in your Coach-Yard, and says, that she will keep them. O! fie, fie, Madam* (said the Gentleman to his Wife) *you must not do so; the Cart and Horses are none of the poor Man's, they're his Master's; therefore you must speak to him, if he has not us'd you well.* The Gentlewoman then presently deliver'd the Cart and Horses, and privately gave the Carman a Guinea besides, for his handsome come off. But the next Day *Nick* bringing some Coals to the same House, he then left the Gentlewoman his Cart and Horses for good and all; for finding an Opportunity of slipping into a Back-Parlour, where a Scrutore was open, he took out of it, a rich Gold Watch, several Diamond Rings; and Two-hundred and fifty Guineas, which he carry'd clear off, without going to his Master any more.

---

C. Friederici, Oel und Wein. Frankfurt, 1719.

p. 55 Der undanckbare Franzos.

Besonders schaffen junge Weiber |
sich gerne was Galantes an |
Sie suchen einen Zeit-Vertreiber |
der einen Gulden stampffen kan |
der Mann scheint Ihnen gar zu spröde |
wann er sonst 1000. Wunder thäte.

Bekandt war eine solche Dame,
da wie man Anno Fänffe schrieb |
die gern zu schönen Leuten kame |
und keinem Antwort schuldig blieb |
und auch wohl Sechsen in die Wette.
ein Rendés-vous gegeben hätte.

Nun waren damals viel Franzosen
Prisonniers in der lieben Stadt |
als denen es an Liebe-Koszen |
durchgehends nicht gemangelt hat |
Weil ihre Airs und ihre Minen,
den Mägden haupt-galant geschienen.

Digitized by Google

Darunter war ein Officiere,
schön von Statur und ganz charmant,
der offt vor ob'ger Damen Thäre |
verschiedne Contrebande fand |
auch dass viel Leute von dem Degen |
mit Ihr genaue Freundschafft pflegen.

Ihr Hauss war wie ein Tauben-Schlage |
flog Jener aus | flog dieser ein |
und dass ich Viel in Wenig sage |
bald musten es Studenten seyn
bald Junckern | Kauffleut | bald Soldaten |
die Amorn in die Flanck gerathen.

Ihr Mann war von dem besten Leime |
ein Kauffmann von Profession,
der | war sein Weibgen nicht daheime |
nie machte grosses Fait davon |
Wann sie gleich in der breiten Gassen |
hat ihren Gulden stämpffen lassen.

Kam ein Galan zu Ihr ins Hause |
so war Er eben auch willkomm |
Er bliebe bey dem Ehren Schmause |
gelassen wohlgemuth u. fromm |
und wiese dass Inn nicht verdriese |
wann Er Ihr ihren Willen liesse.

Das wust besagter Officiere;
als einst ihr Mann nicht war zu Haus |
so schliech er ein zur hinter Thüre |
und machte sein Gelächter draus |
und zeigte mancherley Geberden |
ein Schwager dieses Manns zu werden.

Ein Färblein seiner Sach zu geben |
so fragt Er hurtig nach Madam;
Sie wollt Ihm nicht zu wieder leben |
daher Sie gleich herunter kam
und bittet | dass Monsieur erkläre |
was etwan sein Verlangen wäre?

Digitized by Google

Er sprach nach vielen Tendeleyen |
ick kan der wenigk teusch mon coeur,
Madam er wird Sie mir verseyhen |
je suis toujours son Serviteur,
mein Baisermain dient zu dem Ende |
ob ick Monsieur nit sprecken könte.

Entendés vous, ma Belle Schöne |
ob nick zu Aus ist sein Mari |
ick wollt dass er sick gäb die peine,
auff teuscher Sprock ast es die Müh |
und wär so bon, und mir mein Golde |
von swölff Louisdor changiren wollte.

Marigen fässt Ihn, bey den Händen |
und schaut Ihn trefflich freundlich an |
Sie schneidet 100. Complimenten |
dass Er Ihr den Plaisir gethan |
und dass Er Ihr Visite gäbe |
davor Sie hoch verbunden lebe.

Ihr Mann sey ohnlängst ausgegangen |
zu einer guten Compagnie,
Er werd bald wieder heim gelangen |
dahero bitte freundlich Sie |
ein halbes Stündgen zu verziehen |
und sich die Treppe nauff bemühen.

Sie schielt Ihn mit verstohlenen Blicken |
darbey so frech und kräfftig an |
wie dann das sanffte Hände-Drücken |
auch ziemlich viel darbey gethan |
dass Er | als sonst ein Held von Thaten
ist in Confusion gerathen.

Mein Gallus liess sich nicht lang bitten |
der Gogel-Hahn setzt sich zur Henn |
Er ware trefflich wohl gelitten |
und wiess dass er charmiren könn |
Ach | dacht er | wollt man mich doch heisen |
Sie tapffer auff den Kamm zu beissen!

Digitized by Google

Es gieng Ihm an | ihr holder Munde |
versenckte sich in Seinem gar |
weil Sie in einer halben Stunde |
verschwenderisch im Küssen war |
da Sie | wann Ers ganz sachte machte |
Ihm zeh'n vor Einen zugedachte.

Ihm wurde Herz und Magen rege |
Sein ganzeer Mensch der sehnte sich |
dass er den Zweck erreichen möge |
gesetzt es blieben auch im Stich |
die 12. Duplonen die Er wollte |
dass Ihm Ihr Eh-Mann Wexeln sollte.

Bald frohr Ihn | und bald wurd Ihm heise |
bald schnattert Er mit seinem Mund |
bald krazte Er sich auff die Weise |
wie meines Nachbars Budel-Hund |
bald kam Er gar in das Gedränge |
dass Ihm wird Rock und Wambs zu enge.

Genug | er bot die 12 Duplonen |
Ihr in gebrochnen Wörtern an |
wann Sie wollt seine Lieb belohnen |
die Er nicht höher schäzen kan |
dafern Sie anders am Praesente,
nichts weiters auszusetzen fände.

Das wars | wornach sich die Coquette,
Zum Voraus albereit gesehnt
hier hat der Pfaff die rechte Mette |
auff gut französisch angethönt |
Sie küsste dieses Gold vor Freuden |
und kunt es kaum in Händen leiden.

Marigen lässt sich gleich bereden |
es war Ihr ein gar süsses Wort |
Was Wunder dann wann unter beeden,
gleich richtig wurde der Accord,
wann er ein Mann wurd von den Sorten |
die Näscher frembdes Guths geworden.

Digitized by Google

O Welt | du tumme Masquerade!
als wann kein Teutscher wär so gut |
und so verstünd die Cavalcade,
als irgend so ein funffzeh'n Hut |
der offt in gaist'ge Winckel krieget |
und bey gemeinen Mägden lieget.

Doch Nein | Franzosen sind Franzosen |
ein chamerirt gepudert Kleid |
ein netter Strumpff | bordirte Hosen |
macht einen grossen Unterscheid |
sie stutzen trefflich auff der Gassen |
das Teutsche müssen bleiben lassen.

Sie reden wie die Götter-Kinder |
auff ihrer Zung schwebt Honigseim |
wir Teutsche seyn nur arme Sünder |
und gegen Ihnen wilde Bäum |
wir seyn nur Klozen | die auff Erden |
zu Prügeln abgehauen werden.

— — — — — — — — — — — —

Er bietet auff das Citadelle,
und lauffet Sturm als wie ein Held |
der etwan in dergleichen Fälle |
sich vornher an die Spitze stellt |
bisz man ist ohne länger Bitten |
zum gütlichen Accord geschritten.

Drauff zoh der Kühne Held vom Leder |
Sein Herz war warlich nicht von Eysz |
und hier erröthet meine Feder |
die nichts mehr vorzubringen weisz |
als dasz Sie unter Amors Decken |
sucht die Bataille zu verstecken.

— — — — — — — — — — — —

Indem er fortgieng auf der Strassen |
kam Ihm geschwind die Reu | dass er
die 12. Louis d'Or hat sitzen lassen |
und dass er recht ein Bougre wär |

Digitized by Google

dass er so theur hab das erkauffet |
was Einem offt entgegen lauffet.

— — — — — — — — — — — —

Morbleu! Das war Ihm nicht bequeme |
dass er so läppisch sich verstieg |
drum sann Er auf ein Stratageme,
wie Er sein Golde wieder krieg;
Sein Anschlog litt auch nicht Beschwerden |
wie wir gleich weiter hören werden.

Des Tags drauff Morgen um Glock achte |
gieng er zu der Amantin Mann |
und sagt Ihm | dass er gestern brachte |
12. Louis d'or, ob er solche dann
noch wexeln wollte gegen Müntze |
und was er drauff begehr vor Zinsze?

Vor Aggio wollt der Franzmann sagen |
der Mann sprach: Ihm sey nichts bekandt |
der Err woll seiner Weib nur fragen |
versetzte drauff der Lieutenant,
Was wollte nun die Frau viel singen?
Sie muste die Dublonen bringen.

Der Franzmann steckt sie in die Tasche |
und dunckt darbey sich keine Sau
Er dacht: voila la belle Vache!
Behüt dir Gott der Err und Frau |
adieu, weil gaans mir magk changiren.
will ich die Füsse weiter führen.

Die Frau dacht: Du Franzosen-Schinder |
du teufflisch-abgefeimbter Dieb!
Wie leicht käm jetzt der Mann dahinter |
was ich dir hinters Ohre schrieb |
soll ich | nebst dem was dich kunt laben |
dich Gratis auch tractiret haben?

Digitized by Google

Addendum for note 1, page 36:

J. te Winkel *(De Ontwikkelingsgang der Nederlandsche Letterkunde*[2]*,* III, Haarlem, 1923, pp. 165—6) points out another imitation of Coster's *Teeuwis de Boer* by J. J. Starter (1594—1628).

---

Page 14 line 7 from below: *howerer* should be *however.*
Page 45 line 7 from below: *Du'n* should be *D'un.*

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

NOV 2 1 2003

*The Library*
*University of California*
*Riverside*

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW
Books not returned on time are subject to fines according to the Library Lending Code.
Books cannot be renewed by phone.
Books may be recalled at any time.

Music Library - (909) 787-3137
Science Library - (909) 787-3701
Tomás Rivera Library - (909) 787-3220

2/03

N:o 81—2 . . . . . 20 „
N:o 86—7 . . . . . 20 „
N:o 53, 67, 71, 72, 75, 76 „Kalevalastudien“ in cloth binding . . . . . 240 „

Address: Prof. Dr. KAARLE KROHN, Helsinki, Finland.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google